Appendix P

Shifnal Place Plan Area Site Assessments

Published: December 2020

Site Assessment Process Overview

1. Introduction

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

Stage 1: Strategic Land Availability Assessment
(SLAA)

Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal

Additional Sites Identified Through Consultation

Stage 2b: Screening of Sites

Additional Information Gained Through Consultation

Stage 3: Detailed Assessment of Sites

Figure 1: Site Assessment Process

Stage 1: The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

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

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

Site Assessment Process

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

| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal | Stage 2a consisted of the assessment of the performance of sites against the objectives identified within the Sustainability Appraisal. |
| Stage 2b: Screening of Sites | Stage 2b consisted of a screening exercise informed by consideration of a sites availability; size and whether there were obvious physical, heritage or environmental constraints present, based on the strategic assessment undertaken within the SLAA. |
| Stage 3: Detailed site review | Stage 3 consisted of a proportional and comprehensive assessment of sites informed by the sustainability appraisal and assessments undertaken by Highways; Heritage; Ecology; Trees; and Public Protection Officers; various technical studies, including a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Green Belt Assessment/Review where appropriate; consideration of infrastructure requirements and opportunities; consideration of other strategic considerations; and professional judgement. This stage of assessment was an iterative process. |

2. The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

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

Assessing Suitability:

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

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

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

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

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

2.5. Reflecting upon the above factors:

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

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

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

Assessing Availability:

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

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

- 2.7. Within the SLAA, sites were generally considered to be available where they had been actively promoted for the relevant use during:
 - The 'Call for Sites' exercise;
 - The Local Plan Review; or
 - Preparation of the current Local Plan (Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan).

2.8. Or where:

- There has been a recent Planning Application (whether successful or not) for the relevant use; or
- Officers have particular knowledge about a site's availability.

Assessing Achievability (including Viability)

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

Conclusion

- 2.10. Once the assessment of a site's development potential; suitability; availability; and achievability (including viability) was undertaken and conclusions reached on each of these categories, an overall conclusion was reached.
- 2.11. Sites were effectively divided into three categories, these were:

• Rejected sites:

- o The site is considered unsuitable; and/or
- o The site is considered to be unavailable; and/or
- o The site is considered unachievable/unviable.

• Long Term Potential - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:

- The site is considered to be not currently suitable but may have future potential subject to further detailed assessment; and/or
- o There is uncertainty about the sites availability; and/or
- o There is uncertainty about the sites achievability/viability.

Accepted - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:

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

3. Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

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

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

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

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

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

4. Screening of Sites

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

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

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

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

*Significant physical constraints:

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

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

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

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

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

Please Note:

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

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

5. Detailed Site Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Key Centre: Shifnal

Stage 2a: Residential

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|----------|--|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | _ | P10 | P14 | P15a | P15b | P16 | P17a | P17b | SHF004 | SHF005 | SHF007 | SHF009 | SHF013 |
| | Special Area of Conservation | арріу): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | <u> </u> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| , | Site of Special Scientific Interest | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone or more (record all that apply) |): | <u> </u> | | Ŭ | 0 | Ü | | Ü | Ü | Ů | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a National Nature Reserve 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | 0 | _ | 0 | 0 | _ | _ |
| | | No = zero score (0) | | | | | | | - | | | - | | |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app Children's playground | ny): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all Primary School | that apply): | _ | _ | _ | - | + | - | _ | _ | + | _ | <u>-</u> | - |
| | GP surgery | | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | + | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + |
| | Children's playground | No = minus score (-) | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | + | + |
| | Outdoor sports facility Amenity green space | | + | + | - | - | + | + | + | + | + | - | + | + |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | | - | - | <u> </u> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| _ | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | service offered during peak travel times 4: | No = minus score (-) | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | + | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| / | versatile) | No = zero score (0) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | No = zero score (0) | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | | No = zero score (0) | | 0 | Ů | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | O . | Ü | 0 | Ü | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 |
| | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | No = zero score (0) Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | No = zero score (0) | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | a Scheduled Monument a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield a Registered Park or Garden | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) |): | | | | | _ | _ | | | | _ | | _ |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score () | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 |
| | landscape sensitivity for residential | 2010 30016 (0) | <u> </u> | | | | U | ļ , , | 0 | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | + | + | | + | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | The second secon | Overall Score | -9 | -6 | -13 | -15 | -10 | -7 | -10 | -5 | -1 | -11 | -2 | -4 |
| | Range is 0 to -15 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -10 Poor is -11 to -15 Ove | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Fair | Fair | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Good | Poor | Good | Good |
| | | , | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | L |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: SHF015 | Site Ref: SHF016 | Site Ref: SHF017 | Site Ref: SHF018a | Site Ref: SHF018b | Site Ref: SHF018c | Site Ref: SHF018d | Site Ref: SHF019 | Site Ref: SHF019VAR | Site Ref: SHF021 | Site Ref: SHF022 | Site Ref: SHF023 |
|----------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation | арріу): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | Site of Special Scientific Interest | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | 140 = 2010 30010 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) | 1. | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | <i>).</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | Ů | Ů | Ů | Ü | | Ů | Ů | - · | <u> </u> | | · | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | ,,y,. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 140 - 2010 30016 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all t | that annly): | U | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| | Primary School | ιιαι αρρι <u>γ</u>). | + | - | + | - | - | + | _ | - | _ | - | - | _ |
| | GP surgery | 1 | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | | | | - | + | | - | - | - | - | - |
| J | Children's playground | No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | 140 = Hillius score (-) | + | + | | + | | + | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | + | | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | _ | + | + | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| | service offered during peak travel times 4: | No = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | _ | _ | | | | | | _ | _ |
| , | versatile) | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 0 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) | | _ | | | _ | | | | | | _ | _ |
| O | All of part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | No = zero score (0) | , | _ | - | - | - | - | - | - | _ | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | All of part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 of 3 | No = zero score (0) | O | 0 | - | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| 10 | Sita whally/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | No = zero score (0) | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | U | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | • | _ | _ | _ | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | Vac deutle d | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) |): | - | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | 1 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | | | | | | <u> </u> | | j | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |
| | residential | Double minus score () | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or | | | | | | | 1 | | | + | | | |
| | site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | I ategory is recorded | | | | | + | + | | | + | | | |
| | 1. 10000 11010. Who to a one rand line more than one category, highest sellsitivity ca | Overall Score | -6 | -5 | -5 | -8 | -12 | -4 | -11 | -5 | -9 | -10 | -9 | -9 |
| | | Overali Score | -0 | - 5 | ı -o | ı - 0 | 1 -12 | ı -4 | -!! | ı -o | ı - y | l -10 | l - 3 | -3 |
| | Range is 0 to -15 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -10 Poor is -11 to -15 Ove | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Fair | Good | Good | Fair | Poor | Good | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: SHF024 | Site Ref: SHF025 | Site Ref: SHF026 | Site Ref: SHF027 | Site Ref: SHF028 | Site Ref: SHF029 | Site Ref: SHF032 | Site Ref: SHF033 | Site Ref: SHF034 | Site Ref: SHF035 | Site Ref: SHF037 |
|----------|---|--|--|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation | apply): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | Site of Special Scientific Interest | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | , , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply |): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | , | • | • | | 2 | | 2 | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all | that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| | Children's playground | No = minus score (-) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | No = minus score () | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | _ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | service offered during peak travel times 4: | No = minus score (-) | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | - |
| 7 | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area a Listed Building | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply |)- | - | | | | <u> </u> | " | U | | - | | <u>U</u> |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | / - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential | Double minus score () | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | ategory is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | | Overall Score | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -9 |
| F | Range is 0 to -15 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -10 Poor is -11 to -15 Ove | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: SHF015 & SHF029 | Site Ref: SHF018b & SHF018d | Site Ref: SHF022 & SHF023 (pa |
|----------|---|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | apply): | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| • | Site of Special Scientific Interest | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) |): | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Vaa minus aaam () | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | oly): | 2 | | |
| | Children's playground | V (1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all | that apply): | | | |
| | Primary School | | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - |
| | Library(permanent or mobile library stop) | | - | - | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - |
| | Children's playground | No = minus score (-) | _ | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | | | _ | _ |
| | Amenity green space | | | - | - |
| | | | | - | - |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | - | - | - |
| 6 | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | | _ | _ |
| Ü | service offered during peak travel times 4: | No = minus score (-) | | | |
| _ | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | | | |
| 7 | versatile) | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | - | - | - |
| _ | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | - | - | - | |
| | | | | | |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | No = zero score (0) | | | |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| • • | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | No = zero score (0) | , , , | | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace all existing waste management operation | No = zero score (0) | U | O | U |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| . • | a Registered Park or Garden | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| | a Listed Building | 1- | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) |): - | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | | | | |
| | residential | Double minus score () | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential | Minus score (-) | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | | | | |
| | landscape sensitivity for residential | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | teanry is recorded | | | |
| | I leade note. where a site ians into more than one category, highest sellstivity ca | | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| | | Overall Score | | -11 | -11 |
| | Range is 0 to -15 Good is -1 to -5 Fair is -6 to -10 Poor is -11 to -15 Ove l | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Poor | Poor | Poor |

Key Centre: Shifnal

Stage 2a: Employment

| Proceedings | Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: | Site Ref: |
|--|----------|---|------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Second Annual Consense Content Conte | - Ontona | · | _ | P10 | P14 | P15a | P15b | P16 | P17a | P17b | SHF004 | SHF005 | SHF007 | SHF009 | SHF013 |
| Manual Color | | | арріу): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Application of Section Content | | | <u> </u> | | | | | 0 | | | • | | | Ŭ | Ü |
| Proceedings Procedure Pr | | | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MARINE Files | / | | | | 0 | 0 | · | | | Ţ. | 0 | | | 0 | · |
| Control Name Section Control of more involved all hid agents Con | | | No = zero score (0) | | | U | ŭ | · · | | | | | Ů | Ŭ | 0 |
| Size Security within before come of concer more (presed all first security) | | | | | · | | · | | | | - | | | Ŭ | , , |
| Description of Squared Agent of Conference | | | 1- | U | 1 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | U | U | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 Stocker's infestive finance finance Very - minus accord of 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Section of A Sear A Special Security Interests Section Secti | | 1km of a Ramsar Site | [| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Description of a billion of a place of agreement showing service the state of agreement showing service of the state of agreement showing service of the state of agreement showing service of the state of the state of agreement showing service of the state of the | 2 | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | Ŭ | | · · | | Ţ. | • | | | Ŭ | Ü |
| Sign of a Ministry color (any or group) within at on able douburlay Visit - monits store () | | | | 0 | Ů | Ů | · | · | | 0 | | | | Ŭ | U |
| Section and a local challenge between No + more account 1 | | | - | <u>-</u> | - v | | · | 0 | | - | ŭ | | | Ŭ | Ü |
| 3 The Preservation Charles (Applied or Oxigon) within a control preservation of the Robbins of | | | <u> </u> | | | , , | · | | | | - | | | - | Ţ. |
| See centimal case or sensor (propriet) of the following! Tensor all fibril applications of the following! Tensor all fibril applications of the following! Tensor and fibril applications of the following! Tensor and fibril applications of the following tensor (p. 10.000) | 2 | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | |
| Continues in Subground | 3 | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | U | - | U | U | - | - |
| A contest price from the contest of the following record all that apply: | | | oly): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accordate restrict grainer quarter (Multi-Allahorer institution price) No - service (Mill) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 1 | | Von - minus and () | | | · | | | 0 | | ŭ | | | ŭ | , , |
| Accessable meanured group regions process proteins without with the following (recent at that apply): | 4 | | | | | | · | | 0 | | | | | | Ŭ |
| Site boundary within \$4000 - of one or more of the following (record all that supply): | | | 2010 30010 (0) | | · · | , , | · | | | | • | | | ŭ | , , |
| Privary Strictor | | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all | that apply): | - | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Testion contents | | | | - | - | - | - | + | | - | - | | - | - | - |
| Custoor sports solidy No = minus score () * | _ | | | | - | | | - | | - | + | + | | + | |
| Accessive great appeals | 5 | | | | - | | | - | | - | - | - | | - | |
| Accessible restant grow space (substitutional grows agree) Sile broadly early or gardy or gardy and service of lived charge peak travel terms ** No - minus score (*) A for part of the site within 6 Source Protection Zone (groundwater) No - service score (*) No - se | | | NO ≡ Minus score (-) | | | | | - | | | | - | | | |
| Site boundary within 480m ² of a guide transport node with a requirer No = miss score (-) No = miss score | | | <u> </u> | - | | | | | | | | - | | | |
| Service offered skining peak travel times 1: No = minus score (-) | _ | | Yes = plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site wholly-party within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) Yes = minus source (c) | 6 | | | + | - | - | - | - | + | - | + | + | - | + | - |
| No - zero score (0) | 7 | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All or part of the site within the Souther Protection Zune (groundward) No = 200 score (c) No = 200 score (c | / | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| All or part of the site is within Ficod Zones 2 or 3 | 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| 10 Site wholly/partly within an AP Quality Management Area Yes = minus score (-) No = arror score (0) No | | (3 ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** | \ / | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 Site whollypartly within an Air Quality Management Area Yes = minus score (c) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site windly/partly within an in utularly within an in utularly within an in utularly within an area with a previous industrial or joennically contaminative use No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | (/ | • | | | | | _ | | | _ | 2 | | |
| 12 Site would displace an existing waster management operation No = zero score (0) No = 200 score (0) No | 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| A A A A A A A A A A | 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | 0 | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | 0 | _ | _ | 0 | _ | 0 |
| 12 Site Would applicate in existing waster framegeristic present of management operation No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | , , | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | ``` | 0 | · | Ů | 0 | Ů | • | · · | | • | Ů | | Ŭ |
| Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply): a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 3 exceledued Monument Yes = double minus | | Site wholly/nartly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a Scheduled Monument 13 a Registered Park or Garden a Conservation Avea a Listed Building Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply): 30 | | | γρ· <i>τ</i> /- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 a Registered Battlefield Score (-) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | Von – double minus | | 0 | · | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| A Régistred Fark of Garden | 13 | | | | | , , | · | | | | | | | | Ŭ |
| Conservation Area | | | | 0 | , , | | _ | | | | 0 | | | ŭ | , , |
| Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply): 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | , , | | , , | | | | · | | Ŭ | Ŭ |
| 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | <u> </u> | U | 1 0 | U | | U | 0 | U | U | | U | U | U |
| 14 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | <u></u> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Registered Park or Garden No = zero score (0) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | j t | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| 300m of a Conservation Area - 0 0 0 0 0 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | 14 | | | | | · | | | | | | | | | |
| 300m of a Listed Building Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | No = zero score (0) | | , , | · | | | _ | | | | | - | ŭ |
| Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | | | · | _ | _ | | | | | | | | |
| employment Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment Minus score (-) Minus score (-) Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | | | U | - | - | - | - | U | | - | U | - | U |
| Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Overall Score (-) Overall Score (-) Ninus score (-) O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | Double minus score () | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | Minus seem (1) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | employment | iviirius score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | 15 | | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | | 0 |
| site is inside the development boundary Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | | - | 1 | | | - | - | _ | | | _ | | - |
| Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | + | + | | + | |
| Overall Score -11 -6 -11 -13 -8 -7 -8 -7 -3 -9 -4 -4 | | | I. ategory is recorded | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L | | | -11 | -6 | -11 | -13 | -8 | -7 | -8 | -7 | -3 | -9 | -4 | -4 |
| | | Range is -3 to -13 Good is -3 to -6 Fair is -7 to -10 Poor is -11 to -13 Ove | | | Good | Poor | | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Good | Good |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: SHF015 | Site Ref: SHF016 | Site Ref: SHF017 | Site Ref: SHF018a | Site Ref: SHF018b | Site Ref: SHF018c | Site Ref: SHF018d | Site Ref: SHF019 | Site Ref: SHF019VAR | Site Ref: SHF021 | Site Ref: SHF022 | Site Ref: SHF023 |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | National Nature Reserve Site of Special Scientific Interest | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | score () No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | 140 = 2e10 Score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply |): | | | - | , , | Ů | | , , | | - | , , | Ů | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | ĺ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| _ | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | · | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | 0 | " | 0 | 0 | 1 0 |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that ap | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Children's playground | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) |] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all | that apply): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Primary School | 1 | + | - | + | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| _ | GP surgery | Vac atracas () | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility Amenity green space | No = minus score (-) | + | + | + | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | No = minus score (-) | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | versatile) | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | · | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | All 151 17 0 0 | Yes = minus score (-) | _ | _ | | • | _ | _ | 0 | • | _ | • | 0 | _ |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | | No = zero score (0) | Ü | 0 | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U |
| 11 | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | No = zero score (0) | · | | Ů | • | Ů | · | Ů | Ů | | Ů | Ů | |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | No = zero score (0) | | | | | | - | | | | _ | | |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | μρι <i>y):</i> | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buπer zone a Scheduled Monument | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| " | a Registered Park or Garden | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply | r): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Listed Building Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | U | U | U | U | U | 0 |
| | employment | Double minus score () | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for | | | | | | | | | | | | | + |
| | employment | Minus score (-) | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | 7 (0) | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | _ | |
| | landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is | Plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | site is inside the development boundary | ` ' | | | | | | | | | | + | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | • • | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Overall Score | | -5 | -5 | -8 | -10 | -4 | -9 | -9 | -9 | -8 | -9 | -9 |
| | Range is -3 to -13 Good is -3 to -6 Fair is -7 to -10 Poor is -11 to -13 Ove | rall Sustainability Conclusion | Good | Good | Good | Fair | Fair | Good | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair | Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: SHF024 | Site Ref: SHF025 | Site Ref: SHF026 | Site Ref: SHF027 | Site Ref: SHF028 | Site Ref: SHF029 | Site Ref: SHF032 | Site Ref: SHF033 | Site Ref: SHF034 | Site Ref: SHF035 | Site Ref: SHF037 |
|----------|---|--|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|---------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | annly): | 3111024 | 3111023 | 3111020 | 3111021 | 3111020 | 3111029 | 3111032 | 3111033 | 3111034 | 3111033 | 3111037 |
| | Special Area of Conservation | арріу). | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | National Nature Reserve | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site of Special Scientific Interest | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply) | : | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of a National Nature Reserve 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | - | | | | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | | | , |
| | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following ² (record all that app Children's playground | ıy): | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Amenity green space Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | 140 - 2010 30010 (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all the state of the following) | hat apply): | | | U | , J | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | " | | " | | | 0 |
| | Primary School | παι αρριγ /. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | GP surgery | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Outdoor sports facility | No = minus score (-) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Amenity green space | ., | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| • | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | No = minus score (-) | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | - | - |
| | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | versatile) | No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Yes = minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | No = zero score (0) | U U | U | U | U | U | U | U | U U | U | 0 | U |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that ap | oply): | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | Yes = double minus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Battlefield | score () | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden a Conservation Area | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | a Listed Building Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply) | | 1 | 0 | U | 0 | | " | 0 | " | " | | U |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | • | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area | • • | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 300m of a Listed Building | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for employment | Double minus score () | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for | Minus score (-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | landscape sensitivity for employment Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is | Zero score (0) | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | <u> </u> | + | | + | + | | | + | | | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | | | | _ | | | | | | - | | |
| | | Overall Score all Sustainability Conclusion | | -6 Good | -9 Fair | -6 Good | -6 Good | -9 Fair | -9 Fair | -8 Fair | -7 Fair | -9 Fair | -9 Fair |

| Criteria | Criteria Description | Scoring Guide | Site Ref: SHF018b & SHF018 |
|----------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that | t apply): | |
| | Special Area of Conservation | - | 0 |
| | Ramsar Site | Va a da seb la matrica a | 0 |
| 1 | National Nature Reserve Site of Special Scientific Interest | Yes = double minus | 0 |
| | Ancient Woodland | score () No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Wildlife Site | 140 = 2010 30010 (0) | 0 |
| | Local Nature Reserve | 1 | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply | ·): | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | 1km of a Special Area of Conservation | ĺ | 0 |
| | 1km of a Ramsar Site |] | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a National Nature Reserve | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 |
| 2 | 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest | No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | 500m of Ancient woodland | 110 2010 00010 (0) | 0 |
| | 250m of a Wildlife Site | 1 | 0 |
| | 100m of a Local Nature Reserve | | 0 |
| 3 | Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app | ply): | |
| 1 | Children's playground | | 0 |
| 4 | Outdoor sports facility | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 |
| | Amenity green space | No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | that applyls | 0 |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all Primary School | итат арргу): | |
| | GP surgery | 1 | - |
| 5 | Leisure centre | Yes = plus score (+) | - |
| J | Outdoor sports facility | No = minus score (-) | |
| | Amenity green space | 1 110 = 11111100 00010 () | _ |
| | Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space) | - | _ |
| | Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular | Yes = plus score (+) | |
| 6 | service offered during peak travel times ⁴ : | No = minus score (-) | - |
| | Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most | Yes = minus score (-) | |
| 7 | versatile) | No = zero score (0) | - |
| 8 | All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater) | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | - |
| 9 | All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3 | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 |
| | | No = zero score (0) Yes = minus score (-) | |
| 10 | Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area | $No = zero \ score \ (0)$ | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an | Yes = plus score (+) | |
| 11 | area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use | No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| 12 | Site would displace an existing waste management operation | Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a | | |
| | a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | | 0 |
| | a Scheduled Monument | 1 | 0 |
| 13 | a Registered Battlefield | Yes = double minus | 0 |
| | a Registered Park or Garden | score () No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | a Conservation Area | 140 = 2610 30018 (0) | 0 |
| | a Listed Building | | 0 |
| | Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply | <u>):</u> | |
| | 300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone | - | 0 |
| 11 | 300m of a Scheduled Monument | Voc. minus seem () | 0 |
| 14 | 300m of a Registered Battlefield | Yes = minus score (-) | 0 |
| | 300m of a Registered Park or Garden | No = zero score (0) | 0 |
| | 300m of a Conservation Area 300m of a Listed Building | 1 | 0 |
| | Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for | Double minus seers () | |
| | employment Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for | Double minus score () | - |
| 15 | employment Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high | Minus score (-) | 1 |
| 10 | landscape sensitivity for employment | Zero score (0) | 0 |
| | Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for employment or is site is inside the development boundary | Plus score (+) | |
| | Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca | | |
| | | Overall Score | |
| | Range is -3 to -13 Good is -3 to -6 Fair is -7 to -10 Poor is -11 to -13 Ove | erall Sustainability Conclusion | n Fair |



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

Key Centre: Shifnal

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | P10 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Priorslee Road and south of Haughton Road, west of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 95.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 2856 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A very large and irregularly shaped site consisting of a significant number of agricultural fields; a leisure park focused on a number of large ponds used for fishing; and Wesley Brook and its environs. The site is located to the west of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, south and west is predominantly agricultural, although there is a motel to the west of the site. Character to the east is predominantly residential. The site wraps around Haughton Hall which is a hotel and event/conference centre. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. A portion of the site is located in flood zones 2 and/or 3. The remaining area of the site may still have potential. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | P14 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Shifnal Industrial Estate, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 9.44 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 283 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large irregularly shaped site, consisting of agricultural fields. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to north and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is predominantly commercial. Character to the west is a mix of agricultural and education. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not assessed |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not assessed |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site was identified following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | P15a |
| Site Address: | Land at Lamledge Lane, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 18.00 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 540 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of a series of agricultural fields. It is located within the Green Belt between land safeguarded for future development to the west; Lamledge Lane to the east and south; and the railway line to the north. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the east and west is predominantly agricultural, although land to the west has been safeguarded for future development. Character to the north is a mix of commercial and education, beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the south is a mix of agricultural and leisure, consisting of agricultural fields and two large fishing ponds. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | D15h |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | P15b |
| Site Address: | Land between Hinnington Road and A464, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 18.80 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 564 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | An irregularly shaped site consisting of a series of agricultural fields. It is located to the east of Shifnal within the Green Belt. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However to the south is a large rural residential dwelling and associated buildings on a large plot, a reservoir and several small ponds. To the north are two large fishing ponds. The site is also in proximity of other dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference: | P16 |
|--|--|
| Site Address: | Land at Lodgehill Farm, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 25.17 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 755 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large irregularly shaped site consisting of a series of agricultural fields separated from the built form of the settlement by an adjacent agricultural field to the north of the site. The western boundary of the site is defined by Wesley Brook. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However houses along Park Lane are located to the north east of the site. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability [®] | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | P17a |
| Site Address: | Land south of Priorslee Road and north of the railway line, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 34.00 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 1020 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A linear site consisting of a large number of agricultural fields, which projects out into the countryside from Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, west and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east and south east is predominantly residential. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. Two elements of the site contain identified outdoor sports facilities. The remaining area of the site may still have potential. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference: | P17b |
|--|--|
| Site Address: | Land at Custard Castle, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 30.14 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 904 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of three agricultural fields located to the north of Shaw Lane and south of the railway line. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However there are several rural dwellings/farmhouses on large plots in proximity of the site, including Custard Castle which is surrounded by the site. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown, the site will not be considered for allocation within the next stage of the process. However there is a need to consider the potential to safeguard land that is currently within the Green Belt for future allocation. As in the long term the availability of a site can change, it may therefore be appropriate to consider for future safeguarding. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF004 |
| Site Address: | Land to the rear of Jaspers, Victoria Road |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.11 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Car park to the rear of Jaspers restaurant/public house. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is surrounded by residential and retail / food and drink uses together with some office uses. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² : | Whilst the site is in isolation less than 0.2ha in size, due to its location it is considered that it would have capacity for 5 or more dwellings. Furthermore the site is adjacent to another promoted site (and the other site is considered available and the strategic |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | assessment has not identified a significant constraints). |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | T |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF005 |
| Site Address: | Shifnal W.M. Club and land at 77 Aston Road |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.08 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site comprises a series of red brick buildings and hardstanding/parking alongside the road. The building is in use as a chartered accountants, but was previously a working men's club. |
| Surrounding Character: | The surrounding area is predominantly residential, however there is a nearby employment estate and public house. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| and an armonic of the second o | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | Whilst the site is in isolation less than 0.2ha in size, due to its location it is considered that it would have capacity for 5 or more dwellings. Furthermore the site is adjacent to another promoted site (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraints). |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | SHF007 |
| Site Address: | Stanton Hill Farm |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.79 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 24 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A range of farm buildings which are in variable states of dereliction. The site is located within the Green Belt and is divorced from the settlement of Shifnal and any development would not therefore classed as rural development. |
| Surrounding Character: | The site is located within the open countryside. Surrounding land uses are primarily agricultural although there is a single dwelling on an nearby plot. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Availability Unknown |
| , , | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF009 |
| Site Address: | Shifnal War Memorial Club, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.29 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 9 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of the Shifnal War Memorial Club and associated car parking. |
| Surrounding Character: | Uses surrounding the site are primarily residential and open countryside. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Not Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | As the sites availability for either residential and/or employment development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites |
| Summary: | availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF013 |
| Site Address: | Land north of Meadow Drive, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 3.87 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 116 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A small rectangular agricultural field located between the northern edge of Shifnal and the M54. The site has been safeguarded for future development in Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | The land character to the south is predominantly residential. Land to the north is characterised by the M54 and its cutting, beyond this the land is agricultural in character. Land to the east is predominantly agricultural. Land to the west is currently being developed for residential development. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF015 |
| Site Address: | Land at Beech House, Wolverhampton Road, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.39 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 42 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | 10% |
| General Description: | The site consists of a large dwelling, associated outbuildings and its extensive curtilage. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the north, south and east the character is predominantly agricultural. Land to the west has been granted consent (and development has started) for residential development. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF016 |
| Site Address: | St Peter's Youth Club, Bridgnorth Road, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.41 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 12 |
| Type of Site: | Mixed |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | Approx. 25% |
| General Description: | The site consists of St Peter's Youth Club and its curtilage. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, east and south is predominantly residential. Character to the west is agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to sevelusions |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | SHF017 |
| Site Address: | Lodge Hill, South West of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 35.73 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 1072 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large greenfield site to the south west of Shifnal. The site consists of a series of agricultural fields that lie adjacent to the south western development boundary of Shifnal. The site is divided into three components by the A4169 and Wesley Brook (and associated environs). The site is located in the Green Belt. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the north west; south west and south east are agricultural fields. To the north east are residential dwellings within the settlement of Shifnal. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. A portion of the site is located in flood zones 2 and/or 3. The remaining area of the site may still have potential. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference: | SHF018a |
|--|--|
| | |
| Site Address: | Land to the South of Stanton Road, East of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 4.47 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 134 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | An agricultural field to the south of Stanton Road. The site lies within the Green Belt to the east of land subject to Planning Permission for mixed use development (predominantly residential) on the east of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the north of the site is Stanton Road, beyond which are agricultural fields. To the east of the site are agricultural fields. To the south of the site is a wooded area beyond which is an employment and educational area. To the west of the site is an area being developed for a mix of uses (predominantly residential). |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference: | SHF018b |
|--|---|
| Site Reference: | SHF0180 |
| Site Address: | Land to the East of Shifnal Industrial Estate |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 14.47 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 434 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site comprises two agricultural fields to the east of Shifnal Industrial Estate; south of Stanton Road and north of the railway line. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding land uses are predominantly agricultural, excluding the industrial estate and education facility to the west. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Availability injoirnation . | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Reference: | SHF018c |
|---|--|
| Site Address: | Land to the North East of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 79.50 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 2385 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large site to the north east of Shifnal. The site consists of a number of fields in agricultural use and a number of wooded areas. The site is defined by Coppice Green Lane to the west; the M54 to the north; Upton Lane to the east; and Stanton Road to the south. |
| Surrounding Character: | Land to the east, south and north (beyond the M54) is agricultural. Land to the west is predominantly open space, however there is an area of land to the north west which is currently being built out as residential development. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment | : Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availabilit | 1. |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitabilit | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF018d |
| Site Address: | Land to the East of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 25.16 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 755 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site comprises three agricultural fields to the east of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding land uses are predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not assessed |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not assessed |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| , | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions |
| Summary: | reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Reference: | SHF019 |
|--|--|
| Site Address: | Land south of the A464, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 9.90 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 297 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large agricultural field to the south-east of Shifnal. The site is located to the south of the A464, but is detached from the existing built form of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. There is a single dwelling to the north west of the site. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability | !: |
| Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | SHF019VAR |
| Site Address: | Land south of the A464, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 11.89 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 357 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Two agricultural fields to the south-east of Shifnal. The site is located to the south of the A464, but is detached from the existing built form of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. There is a single dwelling to the north west of the site. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Availability injormation . | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference: | SHF021 |
|--|--|
| | |
| Site Address: | West of Lamledge Lane and Shifnal College and North of Shifnal Industrial Estate |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 6 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Part of an agricultural field to the west and north of Lamledge Lane and Shifnal Industrial Estate. The western portion of the site is part of an existing employment allocation. Land to the west and north has Planning Permission for a mixed residential and care home scheme. |
| Surrounding Character: | Land to the west and north is predominantly agricultural however much of it is a current employment allocation with Planning Permission for a mixed residential and care home scheme. Lane to the south and east predominantly consists of employment and education uses. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | Whilst the site is in isolation less than 0.2ha in size, due to its location it is considered that |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | it would have capacity for 5 or more dwellings. Furthermore the site is adjacent to another promoted site (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraints). |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF022 |
| Site Address: | Land to the North-East of Wolverhampton Road, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 1.74 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 52 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Agricultural field to the south east of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural to the south west, south east and north east of the site. Character to the north and north west is residential as the adjacent land has been granted consent for residential development and is currently being built out. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | Considered within the payt stage of the site assessment process due to constructors |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF023 |
| Site Address: | Land North of Wolverhampton Road and South of the Railway Line and Lamledge Lane, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 13.99 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 420 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large area of land located between Wolverhampton Road (to the south) and the Railway line and Lamledge Lane (to the north). The site consists of three agricultural fields and a wooded area located to the south east of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Land to the east is predominantly agricultural. Land to the south is a mix of agricultural and residential (residential development site to the south west). Land to the west is a mix of agricultural and residential (series of residential development sites). Land to the north is a mix of employment and education. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF024 |
| Site Address: | Land located to the south of Junction 4 of the M54 |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 32.75 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 983 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Large site located to the south of Junction 4 on the M54. The site consists of five agricultural fields and a wooded area. |
| Surrounding Character: | Land to the south and east of the site is predominantly agricultural. Land to the west consists of a mixed use employment area. Land to the north includes a motorway service station and agricultural fields. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ | : |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. The site is more closely associated with the settlement of Telford. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Reference: | SHF025 |
|---|--|
| Site Address: | Wesley Brook, Patons land |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.16 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 5 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Small vacant greenfield site - formerly wooded now scrubland, to the rear of the medical centre and a block of flats. Access to the site would need to be through the car park access/cark park associated with the block of flats. |
| Surrounding Character: | To the south of the site is a medical centre and heavily treed area. To the north of the site are residential gardens. To the east of the site is a block of apartments and associated car park. To the west of the site are residential dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability | !: |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | Whilst the site is in isolation less than 0.2ha in size, due to its location it is considered that it would have capacity for 5 or more dwellings. Furthermore the site is adjacent to another promoted site (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraints). |
| Strategic Suitability | The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3. In isolation, the site appears to be landlocked and does not appear to have a road frontage. The ability to provide an access through adjacent land is unclear. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b Site Reference: | SHF026 |
|---|--|
| Site Address: | Land adjacent to Upton Lodge, east of Park Lane and west of Upton Lane |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.58 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 77 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Agricultural field located adjacent to Upton Lodge, between Park Lane and Upton Lane. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural apart from the small group of dwellings around Upton Lodge. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment. | |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. The site is remote from the built form of the settlement, separated by land that has not been promoted for consideration. |
| Summary: | Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF027 |
| Site Address: | Garage off Bradford Street, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.23 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 7 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Garage and car showroom within Shifnal town centre. |
| Surrounding Character: | The surrounding character is a mix of retail and residential. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF028 |
| Site Address: | 27 Shrewsbury Road, adjacent to St Mary's Church, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.18 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 5 |
| Type of Site: | Brownfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an attractive sandstone building fronting onto Shrewsbury Road, a series of other buildings to the rear and an outdoor grassed area. |
| Surrounding Character: | Surrounding uses include St Mary's Church, and residential dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Currently Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Currently Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF029 |
| Site Address: | Land north of the Uplands, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.45 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 74 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | Area of scrubland to the south east of Shifnal. The site has been safeguarded for future development. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north is residential (adjacent site is currently under development for residential dwellings). Character to the south, east and west is predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Not Currently Available - Likely to become so |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF032 |
| Site Address: | Land off Coppice Green, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 2.84 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 85 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of a linear agricultural field located to the east of Shifnal. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the west is predominantly outdoor sports facilities beyond which is Idsall School. Character to the east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of agricultural and residential. Character to the south is primarily agricultural, although there are also some rural dwellings. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | Not Suitable |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | Not Suitable |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : | |
| Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site is located in the Green Belt, however Shropshire Council is currently undertaking a Local Plan Review, which will be informed by a Green Belt Assessment and Review. The Local Plan Review process will determine whether any sites should be removed from the Green Belt and therefore determine the long term potential of such sites. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF033 |
| Site Address: | The Old Kitchen Garden, Coppice Green Lane, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 0.39 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 12 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of an historic walled garden. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the west is predominantly open space. Character to the north is a mix of open space and agricultural. Character to the south is a mix of agricultural and woodland. Character to the east is a mix of residential and woodland. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | N/A |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² : | |
| | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF034 |
| Site Address: | Land South of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 70.00 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 2100 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | The site consists of a wide range of agricultural fields located to the south-west, south and south-east of Shifnal. The site is sub-divided by roads and the railway line. Site boundaries are defined by a combination of agricultural field boundaries, roads and property curtilages. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north is predominantly residential. Character to the south, east and west is predominantly agricultural. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | N/A |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | CUEOZE |
|--|---|
| Site Reference: | SHF035 |
| Site Address: | Land at Upton Lane, Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 46 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 1380 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large site consisting of several agricultural fields and two large fishing ponds located to the south-east of Shifnal. The site is divided into two distinct elements by Upton Lane. Land to the west of Upton Lane primarily consists of the two large fishing ponds and their environs. Land to the east of Upton Lane is primarily agricultural. Site boundaries are defined by the railway line to the north, the A464 to the south and agricultural field boundaries to east and west. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to east and west is primarily agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of agricultural and commercial. Character to the west is a mix of agricultural, residential and open space. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | N/A |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

| Site Assessment - Stage 2b | |
|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF037 |
| Site Address: | Land to the North East of Shifnal |
| Settlement: | Shifnal |
| Site Size (Ha): | 73.21 |
| Indicative Capacity (Dwellings): | 2196 |
| Type of Site: | Greenfield |
| If mixed, percentage brownfield: | N/A |
| General Description: | A large irregularly shaped site consisting of a series of agricultural fields located to the north-east of Shifnal. Site boundaries are primarily defined by roads and agricultural field boundaries. |
| Surrounding Character: | Character to the north, east and south is predominantly agricultural. Character to the west is a mix of residential, agricultural and open space. |
| Suitability Information: Residential: | N/A |
| (from SLAA) Employment: | N/A |
| Availability Information ¹ : | Currently Available |
| Achievability/Viability Information: | Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. Employment development is generally considered achievable and viable where sites are specifically promoted for these uses. To confirm these conclusions, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review. |
| Availability ¹ : Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability ³ : | The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA. |
| Summary: | Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability. |

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

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

Key Centre: Shifnal

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Site Reference: | SHF004 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 6% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 6% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 94% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | J=70 |
| | 9% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 43% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 78% |
| surface flood risk zone: | .6.0 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | No |
| Historic Flood Map: | 110 |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | No |
| historic flood event: | No |
| | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 100% |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | |
| defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| | 47% |
| detailed river network: | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes |
| Protection Zone: | -17 |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | N/A |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed |
| Visual Impact Considerations | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| | Victoria Road |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Victoria Road |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Assuming small scale development |
| Reasonably be Made So? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ |
| Works? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | |
| Site Works Achievable? | Assuming small scale development |
| | |
| | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 23 |
|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | A watercourse adjacent to the eastern boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. Requires EcIA and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 500m), otters, water voles and nesting birds. The watercourse will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located wholly within Shifnal Conservation Area. Also located within the medieval core of Shifnal and may have high archaeological potential. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA; archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | conservation area. TPO tree adjacent |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | replanted trees along southern site boundary |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Limited opportunity for small scale tree planting to enhance urban tree cover. |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Known to flood, major noise source from Jaspers. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 61 |

| Strategic Considerations: | Small, backland brownfield site comprising the rear car park of the operational Jaspers public house that is visible from the elevated rail line to the south of the site. The site is accessed from a significant highway access from Victoria Road which may provide access to a small residential development subject to highway visibility onto there highway. The site level drops significantly from the highway into the main part of the site leading to some river flooding on the eastern boundary and surface water flooding across the majority of the site in severe flood conditions with known flood events affecting the site. The site directly abuts the watercourse of the Wesley Brook with the eastern part of the site situated within the Green Infrastructure network along the Brook. The site would require detailed ecological assessment and protection of an adjacent Tree Protection Order but the size and constraints on the site provide limited opportunities for the provision of further Green Infrastructure. The site sits wholly within the Shifnal Conservation Area and is situated inside the medieval core of Shifnal. A Heritage Impact Assessment would be required to assess impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to assess the need for detailed investigation of the archaeological potential of the site. Residential amenity on the site is expected to be adversely affected by the Jaspers public house if it continues to trade on the reduced site area following the loss of the car park however, it is expected that some rear car parking may need to be retained for servicing and mobility or emergency access to the public house. The situation of the site within the built form of the town and close to the retail core of the town around Bradford Street gives the site a Good sustainability rating |
|---|---|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes - subject to constraints particularly flood risk and noise |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Land within existing Shifnal development boundary |
| Reasoning | This small redevelopment opportunity could adversely affect the operation of the Jaspers public house and has some significant constraints for such a small site with few apparent opportunities to redress the effects on the developable area of the site. The assessment of the site requires further detailed investigation of the development potential of the land. The site lies within the development boundary, forms part of the built form of the town with direct access to the highway network. The detailed assessments may reveal the development potential of the site but the site is likely to have limited capacity for residential use. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF013 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 10070 |
| surface flood risk zone: | 9% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 9% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 12% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | The state of the s |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% |
| historic flood event: | 5.70 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | |
| | 0% |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | |
| defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Protection zone. | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | This site is currently safeguarded for future development |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | AA-diam |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | NA alline I theb |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Madium High |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Visual Impact Considerations | A.A. J. |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Via Meadow Drive |
| How? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | N |
| Works? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | Y. Possible need to improve T-junction of Drayton Rd with B4379 |
| | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 20 |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of woodland/Env. Network corridor. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Site contains and is adjacent to Env. Network corridors. This will need to be retained and appropriately buffered. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | No known archaeological interest but site is of a medium size, so may have some archaeological potential |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPO on belt of mature trees along road |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | mature trees / woodland to western end of site and abutting northern boundary along motorway |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the south and east |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | The most northern part of the site would require levels of mitigation in relation to road noise which may not be possible as evidenced by the development to the east which was not able to comply with noise conditions specified for the site. As a result no residential development is considered suitable in the site where garden areas would be exposed to road noise. |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Air quality will be impacted by emissions from vehicles on the M54. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Assessment will be necessary to consider the air quality concerns and relevant mitigation proposed where available. It is not considered that it is easy for noise to be mitigated without significant mitigation which must be proved could be achieved prior to any future application being considered. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 65 |

| Strategic Considerations: | This generally flat, smaller greenfield site (3.9ha) is situated on the northern edge of Shifnal adjacent to the embankment of the M54 motorway. The site also adjoins the B4379 Newport Road close to the under pass of the M54. The B4379 would require improvements to the T junction with Meadow Drive to provide vehicular access to the site. The enclosure of the site within the built form of the settlement reduces its landscape sensitivity whereas the larger parcel (east) has medium landscape and medium-high visual sensitivities. The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1) but a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site would require an Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to help sustain the site character and its function as part of the Environmental Network. The presence of any priority habitat may reduce the developable area to permit the restoration and enhancement of the habitat. The trees and hedgerows should be retained or their removal will require compensatory planting in any design scheme. The mature trees to the north and the west are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The site has no known heritage value but the scale and open character of the site suggest the need for a Heritage Assessment. The proximity to the M54 and B4379 indicate a potential noise nuisance within any development, requiring a design solution. The site has a Good sustainability rating because of the accessibility to many of Shifnal's recreational facilities which help to offset the potential effects of development on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes | |
| Recommendation | Include this previously safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development | |
| | . , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | |
| Reasoning | Site SHF013 has been safeguarded for future development for some time. The evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection. The site might be considered for a suitable housing scheme with a good quality contemporary design that would complete the built form of north Shifnal. This site is considered suitable for housing development and is currently being considered for exceptional housing development to meet the community's current need for affordable and low cost housing. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape (medium-high) and visual (medium-high) impacts which are greater than for housing development. | |
| Reasoning If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | Site SHF013 has been safeguarded for future development for some time. The evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection. The site might be considered for a suitable housing scheme with a good quality contemporary design that would complete the built form of north Shifnal. This site is considered suitable for housing development and is currently being considered for exceptional housing development to meet the community's current need for affordable and low cost housing. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape (medium-high) and visual (medium-high) | |

Site to provide a broad range of housing types to meet local needs. The site to be accessed from Meadow Drive through existing gated access possibly requiring verge land to achieve the turning geometry, with stand off from existing residential units to protect their amenity. Consideration to be given to the need for off-site highway works including at Newport Road / Meadow Drive / Haughton Road junction and the strategic road network to address highway capacity, drainage and surface water flooding constraints at this principal junction. Green Infrastructure network to be enhanced to strengthen existing woodland and mature trees around site, provide SUDs drainage system through central area of site to exclude built development and protect site from surface water flooding, open space with equipped play space to be located on east of site with consideration of footpath link to existing developed areas of town to the east. Green Infrastructure to protect the existing corridors through the town and allow foraging and passage of species through the site and use of habitat at site margins. Heritage impact assessment to consider the heritage value of the site and surrounding area and to investigate the archaeological potential of the site. Noise and air quality assessments required due to proximity to M54 corridor with appropriate mitigation measures provided in the layout, design, materials and landscaping of the built development to provide satisfactory standard of residential amenity.

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF015 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | Vee |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0/6 |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 0% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0/0 |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 3% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 370 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | 5/0 |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% |
| historic flood event: | 5/0 |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 0% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% |
| defence: | 5 // |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% |
| detailed river network: | 5 // |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes |
| Protection Zone: | 166 |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | This site is currently safeguarded for future development |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium |
| (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Onto A464 |
| How? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended but will need traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction with other sites off the A464. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 18 |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs. If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The western boundary is Env. Network corridor and is covered by a TPO. There is woodland on the site. There is a pond adjacent to the south-western boundary. GCNs are likely to be present. A buffer of at least 50m around the pond is likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. The site may contain priority grassland habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site includes substantial unlisted historic building (?early C19) known as Beech House, which is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Any proposals which involve the demolition of this building would be resisted. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 building assessment + impact on its settings). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPO on mature trees on site |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | mature trees and hedgerows around and within site |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Road to the north creating noise. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to road. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 69 |

| Strategic Considerations: | This generally flat, small brownfield site (1.4ha) is situated on the south-eastern edge of Shifnal next to the current development by Redrow Homes. The site adjoins the A464 Wolverhampton Road offering vehicular access but requiring a new main road junction possibly shared with other sites, extension of the 30mph restricted zone, traffic calming measures and creation of a town gateway. The built character of the site reduces its landscape sensitivity whereas the larger parcel (east) has medium-low landscape and medium-high visual sensitivities. The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1) but a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site would require an Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to help sustain the site character and its function as part of the Environmental Network. The presence of known priority habitat including grassland and ponds within and surrounding the site may reduce the developable area to permit the restoration and enhancement of this habitat. The mature hedgerows and trees within and around the site should be retained especially those protected by a Tree Preservation Order (west boundary). The removal of trees and hedgerows will require compensatory planting in any design scheme. The site is a non-designated heritage asset due to the presence of Beech House, requiring a Heritage Assessment. The proximity to the A464 indicates a potential noise nuisance within any development, requiring a design solution. The site has a Good sustainability rating reflecting its brownfield character, accessibility to recreational facilities and services which help to offset the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes | |
| Recommendation | Include this previously safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development | |
| Reasoning | Site SHF015 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection. Although the site is better suited to housing use, the buildings on the site are worthy of protection and have a productive use and the surrounding open land has some environmental value. The evidence for developing this small area of safeguarded land is not sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use but it might from a suitable windfall site subject to an appropriate development proposal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape (medium) and visual (high) impacts which are greater than for housing development. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | around 65 dwellings with SHF029 | |

Site SHF015 to be developed as a single scheme in conjunction with site SHF029 to provide a broad range of housing types to meet local needs. Development site excludes Beech House (non-designated heritage asset HER PRN 34751) with garden, curtilage building and frontage walling to A464. Beech House forms part of urban land and no longer safeguarded for future development. Consideration may be given to sympathetic restoration/conversion of house and curtilage buildings. Existing northern access to Beech House to be closed and sealed with existing gates retained. Beech House to be serviced from existing southern access. Highway junction to be situated at northern point on A454 frontage to provide safe junction with good visibility and appropriate measures to manage traffic speeds and highway safety. The development should provide access to the footway and cycling network along the A464 to improve access to local services using 'active travel' options to walk, 'wheel' or cycle to local services.

If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:

The need to conserve Beech House, protect the setting from effects of development and to deliver a safe and visible highway junction to A464 may require removal of mature trees on A464 frontage with complementary planting within the site. Consideration to be given to internal highway layout within the site to make effective use of the developable land and to improve the accessibility of the dwellings to the main and secondary accesses to encourage 'active travel' options to reach local services. Development of site SHF029 to give consideration to secondary access to Park Lane through access strip from backland boundary of site. Secondary access to provide pedestrian and cycling access to Park Lane offering a potentially safer access to local services including the local primary school and with emergency vehicular access into the site only. Any necessary improvements to the local and strategic network to be undertaken. Green Infrastructure network to be enhanced to strengthen existing woodland mature trees around site, provide SUDs drainage system along boundary to safeguarded land to exclude built development and protect site from surface water flooding, open space with equipped play space to be provided, allow foraging and passage of species through the site and use of habitat at site margins. Heritage impact assessment to consider the heritage value of Beech House and the effect of development on the setting of the heritage asset and to investigate the archaeological potential of the site. Noise assessment required due to proximity to A464 with appropriate mitigation measures provided in the layout, design, materials and landscaping of the built development to provide satisfactory standard of residential amenity.

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF016 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 100% |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 4% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% |
| historic flood event: | The state of the s |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 0% |
| ., - | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 00/ |
| defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 00/ |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | This site is situated within the urban area of Shifnal |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | Medium |
| (from the LVSS): | IVICUIUIII |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium |
| (from the LVSS): | THE MAINT |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium-High |
| (from the LVSS): | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | Medium-High |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ |
| Highway Network? | · |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | A4169 |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ |
| Development at the Access Point? | ' |
| Development at the Access Politic | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | |
| | |
| Reasonably be Made So? | |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | Υ |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | Y |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | Y |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 20 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | N/A | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | N/A | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | groups of mature trees to north eastern and western corners of site. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Road to the south creating noise. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to road. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | Club currently on site if demolished and site fully developed for housing would remove a potential noise source from within proximity of existing housing creating a betterment to the local noise environment. | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 73 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This generally flat, small brownfield site (0.4ha) is situated on the south-western edge of Shifnal adjacent to the current Green Belt boundary. The site adjoins the A464 Bridgnorth Road and has an existing vehicular access onto the A464. The built character of the site reduces its landscape sensitivity whereas the larger parcel (west) has medium landscape and medium visual sensitivities. The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1) but a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site would require an Ecological Assessment and Arboricultural Assessment to confirm the level of sensitivity to development. In particular, the site has mature trees to the north, east and west boundaries which should be accommodated into any potential design scheme for the site. The removal of any existing tree or hedgerow cover will require compensatory planting in any proposed development. The site has no known heritage value and is not considered to justify a heritage assessment although the site lies in the setting of adjacent listed buildings and the Shifnal Conservation Area. The proximity of the site to the A464 indicates a noise nuisance for any development, requiring a design solution but the demolition of the existing club-house would produce betterment in the local noise environment. The site has a Fair sustainability rating as a brownfield site with accessibility to local services but this does not entirely offset the distance to the services and the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Land within existing Shifnal development boundary | |
| Reasoning | Site SHF016 is situated within the existing development boundary and forms part of the built form of the town. The site is already developed and has a productive use that contributes to the sense of community in the town. The site also has some environmental qualities worthy of protection. The scale of the site would not justify specifically allocating for housing development, but the situation and character of the site might facilitate its redevelopment as a windfall housing site subject to an appropriate development proposal. This land is not suited to employment development because the land is brownfield with greater development costs, close proximity to existing housing uses and the sensitivities to landscape (medium-high) and visual (medium-high) impacts being greater than for housing. | |
| | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|--|--|
| | |

| Site Reference: | SHF017 |
|---|--|
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | Voc |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 4% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 5% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 95% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 2% |
| surface flood risk zone: | · |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 3% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 7% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| mistoric flood event. | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 31% |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 31/4 |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | |
| defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 5% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Vee |
| Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium and Medium-Low |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium and Medium-High |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High and Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High and High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | A4169 but not onto Park La |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction possibly roundabout with SHF017S. Note this site fronts Park La to the south east but a highway connection at this point would not be acceptable. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | Y. Subject to an assessment of the impact on Innage Rd and Church St and associated junctions. |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and Env. Network corridor (Wesley Brook). | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Northern section: The northern boundary forms and Env. Network corridor (due to the presence of a vegetated railway line). This corridor should buffered and enhanced. Southern section: Wesley Brook runs through this site and a large buffer of riparian habitat forms an Env. Network corridor. An appropriately sized buffer will be required from the Env. Network with no development within. This could be POS. Part of the north-western and south-western boundaries contain or are adjacent to Env. Network corridors and priority habitat (woodland) - these will also need to be appropriately buffered. There is a GCN breeding pond to the south of the site boundary. A buffer of at least 50m around the pond will be required, but given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area, a greater amount of mitigation land is likely to be required. Parts of the site are TPO'd. A PROW runs along the western boundary and a section of the southern boundary (by the pond). Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish, invertebrates and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | opportunity to greatly increase mande and connectivity for sens. | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed Shifnal Manor (The Manor House - NHLE ref. 1176147) and cluster of associated Grade II LBs. Site itself includes putative, but now largely discounted, site of Idsall (pre-1590 Shifnal - HER PRN 00757) and site of a 17th century mill pond. Large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPO on group of trees around property on A464 | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | belt of woodland to north of site along railway and group of trees in semi-natural habitat along watercourse in centre of site, adjoining woodland to the south | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the north and south and along watercourse | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | A4169 runs through the site and is a noise source for consideration. Railway line runs along northern boundary of the site. Farm to the south east of the site with many barns which may produce noise, odour, dusts. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to roads, rail and farm. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good | |
| Appraisal (Residential): Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good | |
| Appraisal (Employment): | Page 77 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This large, undulating greenfield site (36ha) is situated to the west of Shifnal adjoining the A4169 (Bridgnorth Road) to the south and north (comprising site P17b) of this road and extends south to the country road known as Park Lane which is severely constrained by current traffic usage. The land is located within the Green Belt with a moderate-high harm caused by its release. However, of the parcels considered in the Green Belt Review the release of SHF017 (excluding P17b) has a lower impact on the remaining Green Belt land. Accessibility to the B4169 from the south would also provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and an assessment of the impacts on Innage Road and Church Street. However, Park Lane would not provide a suitable secondary access. The site adjoins the built form of the town and the varying topography influences its landscape sensitivity to medium (west) and medium-low (south) however the land remains visible in the wider landscape with medium (west) and medium-high (south) visual sensitivities. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) except for the corridor of the Wesley Brook and has a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions however, the topography may expose the land to inundation which requires a detailed flood risk assessment. The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The presence of priority habitat may also reduce the developable area to restore and enhance any habitat. The site has significant woodland around the railway, Wesley Brook and a Tree Protection Order to the south. This cover should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting in any design scheme. The site lies close to th | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and safeguard for future development | |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. SHF017 (excluding P17b) offers the potential for a large scale housing development with the benefit of access to the A4169 Bridgnorth Road in an area of medium landscape sensitivity. Although these factors must be balanced with the moderate-high visual sensitivity of SHF017 and the moderate-high harm to the Green Belt from releasing this land for development. The release of SHF017 is considered to be justified in order to deliver a new strategic link from the A4169 to the A464 in combination with sites P16, P15b(west) and SHF019 which have lower landscape sensitivities and lower harm from their release from the Green Belt. These land releases may also provide related highway improvements at Five Ways and Innage Road, a range of housing opportunities to meet local needs and improvements to the provision of community facilities and commercial services for existing and new residents of the town. The provision of a strategic highway junction to the A4169 is also considered to present the opportunity to develop the site SHF017 (north) that lies to the north of Bridgnorth Road in combination with site P17a (Priorslee Road) north of the rail line however, releasing these land parcels would cause high harm to the Green Belt. This has the potential to contribute to the longer term provision of new housing and create a future opportunity for a one way gyratory system via the railway under-pass between these two land parcels and using the separate under-pass on Innage Road. These land parcel may accommodate employment development within the broad range of land parcels that may be released to the south and west of the town. However, it is recommended that the release of sites SHF018b and SHF018d will meet the longer term needs for employment in the town | |
| | and so, employment is not currently recommended as an option in relation to this group of sites. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 Site Reference: | SHF018a | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 9% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0,0 | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release of the land would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and would weaken the setting of the historic town with regard to purposes 3 and 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Υ | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Stanton Road | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction possibly roundabout with SHF018c or linking via a new junction at Lamledge Lane. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The collective impact of the developments off Stanton Road will have an unacceptable impact on Aston Street and Curriers Lane and associated junctions which are already at or close to capacity. | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 19 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and adjacent habitats. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site consist of Env. Network corridor. The habitats adjacent to the south may be priority habitat and will need to be appropriately buffered (they look like excellent quality GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat). There are ponds in very close proximity to the site, one of which is a GCN breeding pond and the others are also likely to contain GCNs. A buffer of at least 50m around the ponds are likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II* listed Aston Hall (NHLE ref. 1308059) and cluster of associated Grade II LBs. Site includes a former 19th century brick field (HER PRN 07291), so has archaeological potential | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and mature tree to site boundaries. Block of woodland adjacent southern boundaries | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the north | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 81 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This moderately sized, relatively flat greenfield site (5ha) is situated to the east of Shifnal adjoining Stanton Road and Lamledge Lane. The land is located within the Green Belt with a moderate-high harm caused by its release however, Green Belt parcels to the north would have a higher impact on the remaining Green Belt land. Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and traffic calming measures. However, development of SHF018b would need to restrict vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity. The site lies in the countryside which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium-high and despite its enclosed nature has medium-high visual sensitivity for employment use. The site has no flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees and hedgerows within and around the site with woodland at its southern boundary which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. The site lies in the setting of listed buildings (Grade II) requiring a Heritage Assessment including an archaeological assessment. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone encompassing Shifnal town close to but outside the core zone that lies further to the east along Stanton Road. | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and safeguard for future development | |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. SHF018a offers the potential to safeguard land to support the long term growth of a large scale, new employment area to the east of Shifnal. This potential employment area would have the benefit of access to Stanton Road and the potential to route commercial traffic away the town and towards the M54 at Junction 3 and the secondary route along the A41. The safeguarding of SHF018a (with site P14), in proximity to existing and newly allocated employment activities around Stanton Road / Lamledge Lane has the capacity to support the employment needs of the | |
| | town in combination with sites SHF108b and SHF18d. | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF018b | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No No | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | 163 | |
| | Yes | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 200 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| | 2% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | 576 | |
| December of the city identified as the | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | 10 | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and weakly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release of the land would have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purposes 2 and 3. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | Medium-High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Ĭ | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ | |
| Highway Network? | ' | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Stanton Road | |
| How? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a | |
| Reasonably be Made So? | shared main road junction possibly roundabout with SHF018c. | |
| neadonably be wide do: | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | N | |
| Works? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | N. The collective impact of the developments off Stanton Road will have an unacceptable impact on Aston Street and | |
| Site Works Achievable? | | |
| SILE VVOIKS ACHIEVUDIE! | Curriers Lane and associated junctions which are already at or close to capacity. | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 |
|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and adjacent habitats. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site consist of Env. Network corridor. The habitats adjacent to the west may be priority habitat and will need to be appropriately buffered (they look like excellent quality GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat). There is a pond adjacent to, another 25m from and a third 70m from the western boundary. This ponds are likely to contain GCNs. A buffer of at least 50m around the ponds are likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | mature trees and hedgerows within and around site |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| Appruisur (Employment). | Page 85 |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, undulating greenfield site (14ha) is situated to the east of Shifnal adjoining Stanton Road (north) and Shifnal Industrial Estate (south). The land is located within the Green Belt with a moderate-high harm caused by its release however, Green Belt parcels to the north would have a higher impact on the remaining Green Belt land. Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and traffic calming measures. However, development of SHF018b would need to restrict vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity. The site lies in the countryside which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium-high and despite its enclosed nature has medium-high visual sensitivity. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees and hedgerows within and around the site and any development should introduce appropriate planting and retain existing cover where possible. The site has no known heritage value but the size of the site would require an archaeological appraisal as part of a Heritage Assessment. The site would have a Fair sustainability rating for employment use only, but the limited accessibility to Shifnal's facilities gives a poor rating for housing use. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone encompassing Shifnal town and SHF018b accommodates the core zone in the north-east of site around the adjacent pumping station on Stanton Road. The north-east of the site would need to be kept clear of built development any potential contaminating uses and t |
|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and allocate for employment development |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. SHF018b offers the potential for a large scale employment development to the east of Shifnal with the benefit of access to Stanton Road and the potential to route commercial traffic away the town and towards the M54 at Junction 3 and the secondary route along the A41. The release of SHF018b, in close proximity to the existing, poor quality employment area of Shifnal Industrial Estate has the capacity to redress the employment needs of the town in combination with sites SHF108d and the safeguarding of sites SHF018a and P14. These land releases may also provide related highway improvements to Upton Lane which links south to the A464 Wolverhampton Road. The release of strategic employment land in this location would require significant investment in the infrastructure and development of the land indicating a need to secure a large land release at the outset of the Local Plan. |
| | 1 |

If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: Site SHF018b will be developed as part of a larger employment area with SHF018d to provide serviced land for a broad range of Class B uses with a proportion of other employment generating uses and ancillary service uses to improve the sustainability of the employment area. Consideration should also be given to the relationship with the adjacent Shifnal Industrial Estate and the capacity for the existing development to create a secondary access and for the new development to release the pressure within the existing estate and to improve the character, quality and operation of the existing estate. The development should create a campus style, employment area on the edge of town to enclose the built form of development and any off site infrastructure within the Green and Blue Infrastructure networks. Infrastructure to include a strategic electricity/power supply and sustainable drainage system comprising multi-stage sustainable drainage and water treatment facilities, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. This will serve to create strong boundaries to the employment area to separate the development from the Green Belt and the surrounding rural landscape. At the boundary with Shifnal Industrial Estate, a looser boundary treatment may be considered to support the operation of the functional relationship between these two employment areas. The development of this site will be in accordance with a vision, design code and masterplan prepared in consultation with the public and adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document by Shropshire Council. A construction management plan will be prepared to inform the development of the site. Strategic Transport Assessment and Transport evidence will be required to assess the effects of the development and the cumulative growth of Shifnal on the M54 Junction 3 and the A41/Stanton Road junction. The sites should be serviced from the A41/M54 Junction 3 along Stanton Road with traffic restrictions on commercial vehicle movements to the site using the A464 / Aston Street through Shifnal via the town centre. Sites SHF18b and SHF18d will share a principal access from Stanton Road to serve the employment area and Upton Lane to the viaduct bridge at the rail line will be improved and modified to form the primary distributor road serving the site. Upton Lane forms an historic thoroughfare and the road route or its historical presence will need to be conserved in the development. It is desirable for the viaduct bridge to remain open to pedestrian and cyclist movements. Significant and effective pedestrian and cycle links will be provided along Stanton Road, into and through the development to encourage safe and sustainable patterns of movement between the employment area and the town. Appropriate public transport links should be provided linking to parking facilities on the site to support wider use including the possibility for electric vehicle charging points. The potential to operate a dedicated Park and Ride service should also be investigated. Natural environment assets in proximity to the site and any priority habitats will be safeguarded and buffered. Site design and layout will respect any local heritage assets and the potential for archaeological deposits which will be recorded. Green infrastructure will protect the settings for any identified heritage assets. Historic field patterns and hedgerows will be retained by Green Infrastructure within the grain of the development. Any removal of trees or hedgerows will be replaced as part of the structural planting for the employment area.

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF018c | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | • | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 40/ | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 201 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 2% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 201 | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 201 | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt if released for development due to the level of encroachment on countryside with regard to purpose 3 and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Υ | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Stanton Road | |
| How? | Station road | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit on Stanton Road but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction possibly roundabout with SHF018b. This site (2,385 homes) should not have highway (vehicular) access onto Coppice Green Land unless major improvements can be delivered. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The collective impact of the developments off Stanton Road will have an unacceptable impact on Aston Street and Curriers Lane and associated junctions which are already at or close to capacity. | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 18 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and Env. Network/priority habitats. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site contains patches of woodland (Env. Network and potential priority habitats). These areas should be retained and appropriately buffered. There are ponds on the site. Should GCNs be present in these ponds, a buffer of at least 50m will be required. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. A PROW runs along the eastern and northern boundaries. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments | appearance, to greatly moreuse manual available and connectivity for delia. | |
| Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Potential impact on setting of Grade II* listed Aston Hall (NHLE ref. 1308059) and cluster of associated Grade II LBs. The site includes a former area of parkland for Aston Hall (HER PRN 07504), and a small disused quarry. No other know archaeological interest but very large site size suggests there may be some archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows, mature trees, groups of trees and blocks of woodland within and around site. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development. Opportunity to create larger area of publicly accessible woodland, around existing blocks of woodland | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments | | |
| Opportunities: Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good | |
| Appraisal (Residential): Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 89 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This very large, elevated greenfield site (80ha) is situated to the north-east of Shifnal adjoining Stanton Road (south) and Coppice Green Lane (west). The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release. Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and traffic calming measures. However, development of SHF018c would need to restrict vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity which may be difficult to achieve. The site lies in the countryside but has few significant features which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium and but is elevated with a number of open aspects providing medium-high visual sensitivity. The site has no flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees and hedgerows within and around the site with woodland at its southern boundary which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. The site lies in the setting of listed buildings (Grade II) requiring a Heritage Assessment including an archaeological assessment. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone encompassing Shifnal town close to but outside the core zone that lies further to the east along Stanton Road. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this greenfield site in the open countryside that makes an important contribution to the Green Belt. These other sites have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In contrast site SHF018a would extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and would have significant impacts on the town's setting and its infrastructure particularly its highway network whilst potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of SHF018a. | |
| | 1 | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF018d | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 10070 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 2% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | 5.0 | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | | |
| | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | | |
| | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; strongly against purpose 3; but makes no contribution to purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt if released for development, due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | v | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | y | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | Medium-High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ | |
| Highway Network? | · | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Stanton Road | |
| How? | | |
| Highway Comments Existing Lighture | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | A1 | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N | |
| WO NO | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The collective impact of the developments off Stanton Road will have an unacceptable impact on Aston Street and Curriers Lane and associated junctions which are already at or close to capacity. | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (in trees), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. Most of the boundaries are adjacent to Env. Network corridors. The hedgerows should be retained and buffered. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Poor relationship with existing built form of settlement. No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological desk based assessment + evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and scattered trees within and around site. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Seek to link to / expand offsite woodland to the east | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Possible road noise to west and north and rail noise to south. Also possible noise from industrial uses to southwest. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. Suggest stay away from southwest corner to increase separation to existing industrial/commercial. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 93 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, undulating greenfield site (24ha) is situated to the east of Shifnal adjoining Stanton Road (north) and close to Shifnal Industrial Estate (south). The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release however, Green Belt parcels to the west which have a relationship with SHF018b would have a lower impact. Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and traffic calming measures. However, development of SHF018d would need to restrict vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity. The site lies in the countryside which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium-high and its open aspect has medium-high visual sensitivity. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site requires Ecological Assessment and Arboricultural Assessment. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees and hedgerows within and around the site and any development should introduce appropriate planting and retain existing cover where possible. The site has no known heritage value but the size of the site would require an archaeological appraisal through a Heritage Assessment. The site would have limited accessibility to Shifnal's facilities to redress the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone encompassing Shifnal town close to but outside the core zone that lies to the west along Stanton Road. |
|---|---|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and allocate for employment development |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. SHF018d offers the potential for a large scale employment development to the east of Shifnal with the benefit of access to Stanton Road and the potential to route commercial traffic away the town and towards the M54 at Junction 3 and the secondary route along the A41. The release of SHF018d, in close proximity to the existing, poor quality employment area of Shifnal Industrial Estate has the capacity to redress the employment needs of the town in combination with sites SHF108b and the safeguarding of sites SHF018a and P14. These land releases may also provide related highway improvements to Upton Lane which links south to the A464 Wolverhampton Road. The release of strategic employment land in this location would require significant investment in the infrastructure and development of the land indicating a need to secure a large land release at the outset of the Local Plan. |
| | |

If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:

Site SHF018d will be developed as part of a larger employment area with SHF018b to provide serviced land for a broad range of Class B uses with a proportion of other employment generating uses and ancillary service uses to improve the sustainability of the employment area. Consideration should also be given to the relationship with the adjacent Shifnal Industrial Estate and the capacity for the existing development to create a secondary access and for the new development to release the pressure within the existing estate and to improve the character, quality and operation of the existing estate. The development should create a campus style, employment area on the edge of town to enclose the built form of development and any off site infrastructure within the Green and Blue Infrastructure networks. Infrastructure to include a strategic electricity/power supply and sustainable drainage system comprising multi-stage sustainable drainage and water treatment facilities, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. This will serve to create strong boundaries to the employment area to separate the development from the Green Belt and the surrounding rural landscape. At the boundary with Shifnal Industrial Estate, a looser boundary treatment may be considered to support the operation of the functional relationship between these two employment areas. The development of this site will be in accordance with a vision, design code and masterplan prepared in consultation with the public and adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document by Shropshire Council. A construction management plan will be prepared to inform the development of the site. Strategic Transport Assessment and Transport evidence will be required to assess the effects of the development and the cumulative growth of Shifnal on the M54 Junction 3 and the A41/Stanton Road junction. The sites should be serviced from the A41/M54 Junction 3 along Stanton Road with traffic restrictions on commercial vehicle movements to the site using the A464 / Aston Street through Shifnal via the town centre. Sites SHF18b and SHF18d will share a principal access from Stanton Road to serve the employment area and Upton Lane to the viaduct bridge at the rail line will be improved and modified to form the primary distributor road serving the site. Upton Lane forms an historic thoroughfare and the road route or its historical presence will need to be conserved in the development. It is desirable for the viaduct bridge to remain open to pedestrian and cyclist movements. Significant and effective pedestrian and cycle links will be provided along Stanton Road, into and through the development to encourage safe and sustainable patterns of movement between the employment area and the town. Appropriate public transport links should be provided linking to parking facilities on the site to support wider use including the possibility for electric vehicle charging points. The potential to operate a dedicated Park and Ride service should also be investigated. Natural environment assets in proximity to the site and any priority habitats will be safeguarded and buffered. Site design and layout will respect any local heritage assets and the potential for archaeological deposits which will be recorded. Green infrastructure will protect the settings for any identified heritage assets. Historic field patterns and hedgerows will be retained by Green Infrastructure within the grain of the development. Any removal of trees or hedgerows will be replaced as part of the structural planting for the employment area.

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF019 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | 103 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 100% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| nistoric jiood event. | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 00/ | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 0% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% | |
| defence: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. However, SHF019 is an identified sub-parcel which would have a moderate level of harm if released from the Green Belt. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Υ | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Onto A464 | |
| How? | Onto A404 | |
| now: | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended but will need traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction with other sites off the A464. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ | |
| Works? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | | |
| Site Works Achievable? | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | There are ponds adjacent to the north-eastern boundary - one is a known GCN breeding pond and the other is likely to contain GCNs. A buffer of at least 50m around the ponds are likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments | and the second s | |
| Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed house known as The Terrace (NHLE ref. 1053636). Site also includes a former brickworks (HER PRN 01825). Large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | mature tree within site and hedgerows to the boundaries | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover on the site | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | A464 to the north boundary of the site. Significant historic pond noted on site now filled in potentially causing a contaminated land issue. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. Contaminated land remediation likely to be available. | |
| Public Protection Comments | | |
| Opportunities: Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | Good | |
| Appraisal (Residential): Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | | |
| Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 97 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, gently sloping greenfield site (10ha) is situated to the south of Shifnal adjoining the A464 Wolverhampton Road. This site has the potential for an appropriate highway junction with signage and traffic calming to form a new gateway to Shifnal particularly marked by an extension of the speed restricted zone. However, SHF019 on its own has only limited potential because it does not form a secondary frontage with Park Lane to the south. A new gateway at SHF019 would have the potential along with site P15b(west) to provide the highway entry point into the larger area of safeguarded land south and west of the town identified in site SHF034 which is proposed to be released from the Green Belt and safeguarded for an extension to Shifnal to meet the future development needs of the town. The land around SHF019 is currently located within the Green Belt and the release of land would have a moderate-high harm to the Green Belt. However, SHF019 would have a lower, moderate harm due to its relative position adjacent to the ridgeline that lies to the south of the site and separates the land from the wider Green Belt. The release of this land with the collection of sites in SHF034 to the south and west of Shifnal would facilitate the provision of a strategic highway link from the A464 (south) to the A4169 (south west) to reduce congestion on the highway network through the town and locally on the constrained Park Lane as part of a significant urban extension to meet Shifnal's future development needs beyond 2038. SHF019 is close to the built form of the town with the adjacent safeguarded sites SHF015 and SHF029 now proposed for residential development. The varying topography influences its landscape sensitivity to medium-low but the land remains visible with medium-high sensitivity. The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species close to the site would require appropriate cons | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and safeguard for future development | |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. SHF019 has the potential to provide an access to the A464 (south) and contribute to a large scale housing development with sites P15b(west), SHF017 (excluding P17b) and P16. This would create a continuous link road between the two principal highways at A4169 and A464 and remove any traffic burden on the country lane at Park Lane. SHF019 has the benefit of having medium-low landscape sensitivity and only moderate harm to the Green Belt from its release for development. Although these factors must be balanced with the moderate-high visual sensitivity of SHF019 and the moderate-high harm to the Green Belt from the release of sites P16 and SHF017. The release of SHF019 is considered to be justified in order to deliver the new strategic link from the A4169 to the A464 in combination with sites P15b(west), P16 and SHF017, related highway improvements at Five Ways and Innage Road, provision of a range of housing opportunities to meet local needs and to improve the provision of community facilities and commercial services for existing and new residents of the town. The provision of a strategic highway junction to the A4169 is also considered to present the opportunity to develop site P17b north of the A4169 Bridgnorth Road. This will further contribute to the long term provision of new housing and create a future opportunity for a one way gyratory system via a railway under-pass to link to the A464 (west) in combination with the sister under-pass on Innage Road. These land parcel may accommodate employment development within the broad range of land parcels that may be released as site SHF034 to the south and west of the town. To complement these proposals, the release of sites SHF018b and SHF018d will meet the longer term needs for employment in the town and so, employment is not currently recommended as an option in relation to this group of sites. | |
| | | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | | |
| Capacity: | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | SHF019VAR |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | 163 |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 201 |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 00/ |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 8% |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 201 |
| defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. However, SHF019VAR is an identified sub-parcel which would have a moderate level of harm if released from the Green Belt. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High |
| (from the LVSS): | iviculuill'i ligii |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium |
| (from the LVSS): | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | High |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | <u> </u> |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ |
| Highway Network? | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | AACA |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | A464 |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Assuming review and extension of 30 speed limit and traffic calming/gateway. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Protection of ponds on and adjacent to the site will reduce the no. of houses possible. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | There is a pond on the site in which GCNs are likely to be present. There is a GCN breeding pond adjacent to the northwestern boundary. Retention and protection of the ponds (with appropriate buffers) will reduce the no. of houses possible. Given the number of known GCN ponds in the area, a large amount of mitigation land is likely to be required. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows, trees and ponds will need to be buffered. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments | Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for deles. | |
| Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed house known as The Terrace (NHLE ref. 1053636). Site also includes a former brickworks (HER PRN 01825). Large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPO on land adjacent northern boundary | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows, mature trees, groups of trees within and around site. Pond in south-west part of site. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | enhance tree cover within site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity. Retain pond and expand tree cover around it within public open space as part of future development | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | A464 to the north boundary of the site. Significant historic pond noted on site now filled in potentially causing a contaminated land issue. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. Contaminated land remediation likely to be available. | |
| Public Protection Comments | | |
| Opportunities: Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | | |
| Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 101 | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF021 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | NO | |
| | Yes | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | 201 | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | 0/6 | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | •/ | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| | 0% | |
| defence: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | 5.0 | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | ies | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | N/A | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | Not Assessed | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Υ | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Lamledge Lane | |
| How? | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| | v | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Y | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Assuming footway added at site frontage - to link with existing footway at northern edge of site. | |
| Reasonably be Made So? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ | |
| Works? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | | |
| Site Works Achievable? | Due to small scale of development | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 |
|--|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | There is a GCN breeding pond across the road to the east of the site. Mitigation land may be required on the site. Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers and nesting birds. Hedgerows and trees will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | N/A |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | N/A |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | small site restricted by mature trees particularly on eastern boundary |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | trees to east and southern boundaries |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | landscaping potential limited by small size of site |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Noise source from depot and access to allege lane industrial site noise sources. Possible contaminated land. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 105 |

| Strategic Considerations: | Site SHF021 forms a small rectangular paddock adjacent to an area of mixed residential and employment allocations. The development of the allocated land will extend the built form of the town to join with the peripheral developments of the Shifnal Hillcrest School and the existing Shifnal Industrial Estate. Site SHF021 has a large frontage to Lamledge Lane with an existing gated field entrance and would require an appropriate highway junction and provision of a footway to link to the existing footway network to the north where Lamledge Lane forms a junction with Aston Road. The site has no known flood risks either from watercourses or surface water runoff. The distance from the current built form of the town also suggests limited heritage value but as part of the larger land parcels the archaeological potential of the site may need to be investigated. The site does lie over a Source Protection Zone encompassing the east of Shifnal but SHF021 is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. The site would require detailed ecological assessment and protection of the trees and hedgerows on the eastern boundary. The need to protect trees and hedgerows and to enhance the Green Infrastructure network in this part of town would constrain the site capacity particularly in the east of the site. Noise assessment is required due to proximity to the surrounding employment uses and the commercial traffic using Lamledge Lane with appropriate mitigation measures to be provided in the layout, design, materials and landscaping of the built development to provide satisfactory standards of residential amenity. The site has a fair sustainability rating due to accessibility to some of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for the potential effects of the environmental values of the site. | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Land within existing Shifnal development boundary | |
| Reasoning | This small development opportunity will remain as a pocket of agricultural land on the edge of an extensive area of mixed use development extending the built form of the town to the east. The site has the potential to complete the pattern of development in this location, to help meet the housing needs of the town and to provide new housing close to the existing and proposed new employment areas serving Shifnal. The development potential of the land requires further detailed assessment but the land lies within the development boundary, will soon form a stronger element of the built form of the town with direct access to the highway network and the capacity to join with the footway network. The detailed assessments may reveal the development potential of the site but the site is likely to have limited capacity for residential use due to its size and environmental qualities around the eastern boundary. | |
| | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF022 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | Yes | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Tes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| • | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 5/3 | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 201 | |
| detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | V | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | This site is currently safeguarded for future development | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Y | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Onto A464 | |
| How? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | A1 | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended but will need traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction with other sites off the A464. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 18 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in developable area due to presence of woodland/Env. Network | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site consists of Env. Network corridor and is adjacent to what looks like excellent GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The woodland will need to be appropriately buffered. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | N/A | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | N/A | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | NB. 2008 Heritage Assessment by Waterman CMP Ltd still largely valid | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and mature tree to south and east site boundaries and mature woodland to the north | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the north | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 109 | |

| Recommendation Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. Potential for Windfall? Yes Recommendation Include this previously safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development Site SHF022 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape (medium) and visual (high) impacts which are greater than for housing development. | Strategic Considerations: | This smaller, relatively flat greenfield site (1.7ha) is situated on the south-eastern edge of Shifnal adjoining the A464 Wolverhampton Road. This site offers the potential for a suitable highway junction onto the A464 that might be shared with adjoining sites and to provide for an extension of the speed restricted zone and traffic calming. The site adjoins the built form of the town and is currently safeguarded for development and so, has no direct effect on the Green Belt. The land comprises a relatively flat area of land used for grazing which influences its landscape sensitivity (medium-low) but the land has an open aspect with a higher visual sensitivity (medium-high). The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain its function in the Environmental Network. The presence of priority habitat may also reduce the developable area to a degree. The site has mature trees and hedgerows to the south and east boundaries and mature woodland to the north which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. Proximity to the A464 indicates a need for a noise assessment and mitigation as part of the design solution in any development. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Potential for Windfall? Potential for Allocation? Yes Recommendation Include this previously safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development Site SHF022 has been safeguarded for future development boundary and allocate for housing development Site SHF022 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | • | | |
| Recommendation Site SHF022 has been safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development Site SHF022 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | | |
| Recommendation Site SHF022 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | Potential for Windfall? | | |
| Site SHF022 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | Potential for Allocation? | Yes | |
| positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | Recommendation | Include this previously safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development | |
| | Reasoning | positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies on the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough lies between this site and further safeguarded land to the north and presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme. The site is better suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: around 100 dwellings with SHF023 part | | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | These two sites SHF022 and SHF023 (south) should ideally be developed together, or the two development sites should have inter-related development schemes. The two sites require a suitable joint highway access to serve both sites and inter-related drainage solutions that remediate for any surface water issues on SHF023. The two sites both include the significant wooded area of Revell's Rough which must be appropriately managed within the developments but should address the physical separation of these sites from the further safeguarded land to the north. Other relevant supporting studies should be undertaken particularly transport assessments, ecology, tree and hedgerow surveys, flood risk and drainage with their recommendations clearly reflected in the proposed development scheme. Careful consideration will need to be given to the creation of an effective urban edge to the settlement and the strengthening of the Green Belt boundary adjoining site SHF023. Any necessary improvements to the local and strategic network to be undertaken. |
|--|---|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF023 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 00/ | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% 0% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 1% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 1% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 3% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 5,0 | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 070 | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| December of the site identified and the | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | This site is currently safeguarded for future development | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Ŭ . | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ | |
| Highway Network? | · | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Onto A464 but not onto Lamledge Lane | |
| How? | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| | IN IN | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended but will need traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction with other sites off the A464. This site (420 homes) should not have highway (vehicular) access onto Lamledge Land unless major improvements can be delivered along its whole length and along Upton Lane. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | γ | |
| Works? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | | |
| Site Works Achievable? | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 18 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and woodland/Env. Network. If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site consists of Env. Network corridor. The site may contain priority grassland and woodland habitats - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. There are GCN breeding ponds on the site. A buffer of at least 50m around the ponds are likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. This site looks like it contains some excellent GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The woodland and hedgerows will need to be appropriately buffered. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site previously included areas of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 21024) but EA Lidar data indicates these are now ploughed out. Large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | block of mature woodland across centre of site and groups of trees around existing development in northern end of site. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development. Opportunity to create larger area of publicly accessible woodland, around existing block of woodland | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | A464 to south of the site and railway line to the north creating noise sources. To north of rail is an industrial area also creating potential noise, dust, odour etc. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road and rail. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair | |
| луунизин (шпуюушенц). | Page 113 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, relatively flat greenfield site (14ha) is situated on the south-eastern edge of Shifnal adjoining the A464 Wolverhampton Road. The site is separated into two discrete land parcels situated to the north and south of the Revell's Rough woodland. The northern parcel is relatively isolated being served by the Lamledge via a restricted road bridge over the railway and comprising a relatively tranquil area of land close to the town. The southern parcel sits on the A464 frontage and mirrors the size and situation of adjoining site SHF022. This southern area of the site offers the potential for a suitable highway junction onto the A464 that might be shared with adjoining sites and to provide for an extension of the speed restricted zone and traffic calming. The site is close to the built form of the town and is currently safeguarded for development and so, has no direct effect on the Green Belt. The land southern area comprises a relatively flat area of land which influences its landscape sensitivity (medium-low) but the land has an open aspect to the west and east with a higher visual sensitivity (medium-high). The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain its function in the Environmental Network. The presence of priority habitat may also reduce the developable area to a degree. The site has mature trees and hedgerows to the north boundaries and the mature woodland of Revell's Rough which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. Proximity to the A464 to the south indicates a potential noise nuisance requiring a design solution in any development. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lie | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes but only the southern portion of the larger site | |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes but only the southern portion of the larger site | |
| Recommendation | Include the previously safeguarded land fronting the A464 up to and including Revells Rough within the development boundary and allocate for housing development The land north of Revells Rough to remain outside the development boundary and be safeguarded for future development | |
| Reasoning | Site SHF023 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection, the land does not form part of the Green Belt, now lies close to the built edge of the town and was previously indicated as land suitable for future development. The woodland known as Revell's Rough separates this site into two discrete areas with further safeguarded land to the north. Revell's Rough therefore presents a development challenge to bring the land forward and to incorporate the woodland into the development scheme in a manner that would permit the land to the north to be made available for development. The area of the site on the A464 frontage is suited to housing use and lies in an area currently preferred by the housing market with significant existing investment in infrastructure to support further development. The evidence for developing this smaller area of safeguarded land on the A464 frontage is sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing use to contribute to the residual requirement for housing in Shifnal. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape (medium) and visual (high) impacts which are greater than for housing development. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | around 100 dwellings with SHF022 | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | These two sites SHF022 and SHF023 (south) should ideally be developed together, or the two development sites should have inter-related development schemes. The two sites require a suitable joint highway access to serve both sites and inter-related drainage solutions that remediate for surface water issues on SHF023. The two sites both include the significant wooded area of Revell's Rough which must be appropriately managed within the developments but should address the physical separation of these sites from the further safeguarded land to the north. Other relevant supporting studies should be undertaken particularly transport assessments, ecology, tree and hedgerow surveys, flood risk and drainage with their recommendations clearly reflected in the proposed development scheme. Careful consideration will need to be given to the creation of an effective urban edge to the settlement and the strengthening of the Green Belt boundary adjoining site SHF023. Any necessary improvements to the local and strategic network to be undertaken. |
|--|---|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF027 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | 163 | |
| | Yes | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | 201 | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 277 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| | 1% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | 0/6 | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 57% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site henefitting from | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% | |
| defence: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 10% | |
| detailed river network: | 10/0 | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Vec | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | N/A | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | · · | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| | Υ | |
| Highway Network? | | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Cheapside or Shrewsbury Road | |
| How? | | |
| Highway Comments Existing Highway | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | V | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Y | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Small scale development | |
| Reasonably be Made So? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ | |
| Works? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | | |
| Site Works Achievable? | Small scale development | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 24 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Requires surveys for bats and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located partially within and adjacent to the Shifnal Conservation Area and potentially within the settings of a number of listed buildings. Currently occupied by a number of buildings that may comprise non-designated heritage assets. Also located within the medieval core of Shifnal and may have high archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of LBs; historic buildings assessment; archaeological DBA + evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | residential hedges border western boundary | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | enhance tree cover within site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity. | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Noise sources of main roads. Contaminated land survey will be required. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Contaminated land survey. Noise assessment. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 117 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This brownfield site is currently in a productive use as a retail vehicular sales places and repair workshop in the retail core of the town with direct access to the highway network from a service road on the frontage to Cheapside/Bradford street and a secondary access to Shrewsbury Road. The current use would indicate the need for investigation of possible ground contamination with treatment during any redevelopment of the land. The site has no known watercourse flooding risk and only a small peripheral risk of surface water flooding in severe conditions. The site has the potential for a small scale redevelopment opportunity but residential use would reduce the floorspace in the retail core. The location in the retail core on a principal junction between Shrewsbury Road and Bradford Street would require a noise assessment of highway traffic movements. This assessment may require appropriate mitigation measures in the layout, design, materials and landscaping of any built development particularly to provide satisfactory standards of residential amenity in an housing redevelopment. The site will require a heritage impact assessment as it lies within the medieval core of Shifnal and partially within and adjacent to the Shifnal Conservation Area and in the setting of a number of listed buildings. The assessment should consider impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, investigation of the archaeological potential of the site and the presence of non-designated heritage assets on the site. Any redevelopment will require strengthening of the Green Infrastructure network including the protection of hedgerows on the western boundary. The site lies over a Source Protection Zone covering Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the east. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Land within existing Shifnal development boundary | |
| Reasoning | This small site should continue in its current use provided the site and location remain viable for this business use. The redevelopment of the site has the potential to contribute to the range of uses and the vitality and viability of the retail core of the town. The redevelopment potential of the land requires further detailed assessment but the land lies within the development boundary, forms an integral part of the urban form and retail area with direct access to the highway network and is well served by the footway network. The detailed assessments may reveal the site has ground contamination but forms a significant part of the heritage of this historic town. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF028 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 10070 | |
| | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 5.0 | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | -17 | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | N/A | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Not Assessed | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Y | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | A464 Victoria Road and Shrewsbury Road | |
| How? | 7.10 F Victoria Road and Sinewsbury Road | |
| now; | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Small scale development | |
| Reasonably be Made So? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ | |
| Works? | | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | Casall asala darralamasant | |
| Site Works Achievable? | Small scale development. | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 23 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Requires surveys for bats and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site located partially within and adjacent to the Shifnal Conservation Area. Currently occupied by a former works industrial that is likely to comprise non-designated heritage assets. Also located within the post-medieval core of Shifnal and may have some archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA; historic buildings assessment; archaeological DBA + evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | A scheme which seeks to retain and convert elements of the most significant former works buildings would help to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | conservation area | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedge to southern boundary and a few trees within the site | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | limited opportunity for small scale tree planting to enhance urban tree cover | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Contaminated land investigation required, noise assessment for Shrewsbury and Victoria Road. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 121 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This brownfield site accommodates a former industrial works but is a relatively high quality sandstone building with the potential to be a non-designated heritage asset worthy of retention and conversion to a new use to conserve and enhance the character and structure of the building. The site will require a heritage impact assessment as it lies within the medieval core of Shifnal and partially within and adjacent to the Shifnal Conservation Area and in the setting of a number of listed buildings. The assessment should consider impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, investigation of the archaeological potential of the site and the presence of non-designated heritage assets on the site. The site has direct access to the highway network from a generous drop kerb access on Shrewsbury Road with the potential for a secondary rear access to Victoria Road subject to traffic flows and on street parking constraints on these accesses. The previous industrial use of the site indicates the need for investigation of possible ground contamination with treatment during any redevelopment of the land. The site has no known watercourse flooding risk and no known surface water flooding even in severe conditions. The site has the potential for a small scale redevelopment opportunity but residential use would require a noise assessment of highway traffic movements with appropriate mitigation measures in the layout, design, materials and landscaping of any built development to provide satisfactory standards of residential amenity. Any redevelopment will require strengthening of the Green Infrastructure network including the protection of hedgerows on the southern boundary and trees within the site which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. The site lies over a Source Protection Zone covering Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the east. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Land within existing Shifnal development boundary | |
| Reasoning | This small redevelopment opportunity requires a new productive use for these historical industrial buildings. They are of substantial construction and could offer attractive accommodation for either a contemporary employment or residential use. The redevelopment of the site for residential use has the potential to contribute to the range and choice of housing types and sizes in the town and is located close to the central retail area. The redevelopment potential of the land requires further detailed assessment but the lies within the development boundary, forms an integral part of the urban form, is close to the principal Five Ways Junction and is readily accessible to the strategic routes into/out of town on the A4169 and the A464 to M54 Junction 4. The site is well served by the urban highway network and footway network to the front and rear of the site. The detailed assessments may reveal ground contamination but the site has the potential to be confirmed as a significant element of the industrial heritage of this historic town. | |
| | l l | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF029 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 10070 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | 1% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 3% | |
| historic flood event: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | | |
| | 16% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 00/ | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | This site is currently safeguarded for future development | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | Υ | |
| Highway Network? | | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Onto Park La | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | N. Unless access can be gain access to A464 via SH015 and/or SHF019. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. Unlikely that necessary improvements along Park La can be secured due to the need for third party land. | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs. If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site forms an Env. Network corridor and is covered by a TPO. The site may contain priority grassland habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. There are GCN breeding ponds adjacent to the site. A buffer of at least 50m around the ponds are likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. This site looks like excellent quality GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 21024) present across much of the site. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?Level 2 earthwork survey). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | mature trees may be under TPO | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | mature trees and scrub around site boundaries. Mature tree at tight site access may be a constraint | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover on the site | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | Good site with no notable constraints identified. | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 125 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This generally flat, small brownfield site (1.4ha) is situated on the south-eastern edge of Shifnal next to the current development by Redrow Homes. The site adjoins Park Lane where highway access would be constrained by roadway capacity and the limited opportunity for highway improvements. The developability of the land would rely on a suitable access onto the A464 Wolverhampton Road. The proximity to the built form of the town reduces its landscape sensitivity (medium-low) but increase the visual sensitivity (medium-high). The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1) but the land may be prone to inundation which requires a detailed flood risk assessment. The site would require an Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to help sustain the site character and its function as part of the Environmental Network. The presence of known priority habitat including grassland and ponds within and surrounding the site may reduce the developable area to permit the restoration and enhancement of this habitat. The mature hedgerows and trees within and around the site should be retained especially where protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The site has some heritage value which would require an archaeological appraisal through a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Fair sustainability rating reflecting its accessibility to recreational facilities and services which help to offset the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | Yes | |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes | |
| Recommendation | Include this previously safeguarded land within the development boundary and allocate for housing development | |
| | Site SHF029 has been safeguarded for future development and the evidence of the developability of the site provides positive indications of the suitability and availability of the land. Although the site would be better suited to housing use | |
| Reasoning | the open land on the site has environmental qualities worthy of protection. The evidence for developing this small area of safeguarded land is not sufficient to justify specifically allocating this land for housing but it might form a suitable windfall site subject to an appropriate development proposal that conserved the value of the site. This land is not suited to employment development because of the smaller size of the areas, close proximity to existing housing development and the sensitivities to landscape (medium) and visual (high) impacts which are greater than for housing development. | |

Site SHF029 to be developed as a single scheme in conjunction with site SHF015 to provide a broad range of housing types to meet local needs. Development site excludes Beech House (non-designated heritage asset HER PRN 34751) with garden, curtilage building and frontage walling to A464. Beech House forms part of urban land and no longer safeguarded for future development. Consideration may be given to sympathetic restoration/conversion of house and curtilage buildings. Existing northern access to Beech House to be closed and sealed with existing gates retained. Beech House to be serviced from existing southern access. Highway junction to be situated at northern point on A454 frontage to provide safe junction with good visibility and appropriate measures to manage traffic speeds and highway safety. The development should provide access to the footway and cycling network along the A464 to improve access to local services using 'active travel' options to walk, 'wheel' or cycle to local services.

If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: The need to conserve Beech House, protect the setting from effects of development and to deliver a safe and visible highway junction to A464 may require removal of mature trees on A464 frontage with complementary planting within the site. Consideration to be given to internal highway layout within the site to make effective use of the developable land and to improve the accessibility of the dwellings to the main and secondary accesses to encourage 'active travel' options to reach local services. Development of site SHF029 to give consideration to secondary access to Park Lane through access strip from backland boundary of site. Secondary access to provide pedestrian and cycling access to Park Lane offering a potentially safer access to local services including the local primary school and with emergency vehicular access into the site only. Any necessary improvements to the local and strategic network to be undertaken. Green Infrastructure network to be enhanced to strengthen existing woodland mature trees around site, provide SUDs drainage system along boundary to safeguarded land to exclude built development and protect site from surface water flooding, open space with equipped play space to be provided, allow foraging and passage of species through the site and use of habitat at site margins. Heritage impact assessment to consider the heritage value of Beech House and the effect of development on the setting of the heritage asset and to investigate the archaeological potential of the site. Noise assessment required due to proximity to A464 with appropriate mitigation measures provided in the layout, design, materials and landscaping of the built development to provide satisfactory standard of residential amenity.

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF032 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 5% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 7% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 21% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| mstoric flood event. | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | U/0 | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| | 0% | |
| defence: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt if released for development due to the level of encroachment on countryside with regard to purpose 3 and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Υ | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Coppice Green La | |
| How? | σορρίος στος τι τα | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The collective impact of the developments off Stanton Road and Coppice Green Lane will have an unacceptable impact on Aston Street and Curriers Lane and associated junctions which are already at or close to capacity. | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 19 | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. The woodland and adjacent hedgerows will need to be retained and appropriately buffered. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Probable impact on setting of Grade II* listed Aston Hall (NHLE ref. 1308059) and cluster of associated Grade II LBs. HER indicates site within the former park to Aston Hall (HER PRN 07504). | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs + archaeological DBA). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | block of woodland adjacent north-west boundary and hedgerow and trees to west and southern boundaries. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Road to the west of the site creating a noise source. School to west which will create some noise however not anticipated to impact on the development in a detrimental way due to hours of operations etc. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 129 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This smaller, gently sloping greenfield site (3ha) is situated to the north-east of Shifnal adjoining Coppice Green Lane (west). The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release. Coppice Green Lane served from Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to widening improvements to the Lane to increase highway and parking capacity. However, development of SHF032 will produce some increase in vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity. The site lies in the countryside but has few significant features which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium and but is elevated with a number of open aspects providing medium-high visual sensitivity. The site has some flood risk (Flood Zone 1) from a significant surface water risk in severe conditions. The site requires Ecological Assessment and Arboricultural Assessment. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees and hedgerows tot eh west and south and woodland to the north-west which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. The site lies in the setting of listed buildings (Grade II) requiring a Heritage Assessment including an archaeological assessment. The site has a Good sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| Reasoning | Site SHF032 is situated on the edge of Shifnal adjoining the mixed use developments along Coppice Green Lane and close to the building conversions within the Aston Hall complex. SHF032 offers the potential to enclose some of these mixed use developments and to create a 'sense of place' by consolidating the built urban form along Coppice Green Lane. This sense of place is intended to settle the preferred use of SHF032 to further consolidate the open spaces and recreational uses | |
| | within the campus of Idsall School and to create an opportunity to improve the highway and cart parking capacities along Coppice Green Lane. This land is not suited to employment development because the sensitivities to landscape and visual impacts (both medium-high) are greater than for housing use. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | Coppice Green Lane. This land is not suited to employment development because the sensitivities to landscape and visual | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF033 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| , | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release for development would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 2 to separate adjoining towns and the level of encroachment on the setting of the town under purpose 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | <u> </u> | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | N | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Y. If access onto Coppice Green La can be secured across strip of land between | |
| How? | 1. In access onto copplice orden to can be secured across strip or land between | |
| | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assuming access can be secure to Coppice Green Lane via Aston Hall track | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | Due to small scale development but would still add impact on Aston Street, Curriers lane and associated junctions | |
| | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 22 |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site lies within an Env. Network corridor. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows and trees will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | Site within walled garden and of the setting of Grade II* Aston Hall (NHLE ref. 1308059). Walled garden itself is likely to be deemed curtilage listed. Scheme in this location would only be possible if it could be justified as enabling development in line with Historic England's guidance. |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | area TPO adjacent to south-east of site |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | mature trees to north, west and east boundaries |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Ensure appropriate development stand-off form trees south of the site |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | limited opportunity for small scale tree planting to enhance urban tree cover |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair |
| ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Page 133 |

| Strategic Considerations: | Site SHF033 lies in the setting of the Grade II* listed Aston Hall and is the walled garden that supplied the former kitchens to the Hall. The site could be accessed along the access lane into the Aston Hall complex but development of the site would have some affect on the surrounding highway network and principal junctions. The site is in the Green Belt adjoining the boundary with the town along Coppice Green Lane. The release of the land for development would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt arising from the weakening of the role of the Green Belt in separating adjoining towns and the encroachment into the setting of the town. The site would require detailed ecological assessment and protection of the trees and hedgerows around the site and the Tree Protection order to the south-east boundary. The need to protect trees and hedgerows and to enhance the Green Infrastructure network in this part of town would constrain the site capacity although there are only limited opportunities to enhance the tree cover across the site. The site has no known watercourse flooding risk and no known surface water flooding even in severe conditions. The site will require a heritage impact assessment as it lies within the setting of Aston Hall and its curtilage listed structures. The assessment should consider impacts on the significance and setting of the Hall and investigate the archaeological potential of the site. The site lies over a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the east. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| | This small curtilage listed feature should be protected as part of the history and interpretation of Aston Hall. The site forms | |
| Reasoning | part of the Green Belt containing the town on its north-eastern edge where the wall, tree and hedgerow boundary help to strengthen the edge of the Green Belt along Coppice Green Lane. The development potential of the land would require further detailed assessment but the release of this small site from the Green Belt to deliver windfall residential development would require evidence of very special circumstances. | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|--|--|
| | |

| the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Medium-Low and Medium Wisual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Medium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access | Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Mineral Sofeguerding Area? Wholly or Party Todas 1-2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of see in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of see in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of see in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 ane 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 4: Percenta | Site Reference: | SHF034 | |
| Mineral Sofeguerding Area? Wholly or Party Todas 1-2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of see in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of see in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of see in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 ane 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in Hood 2 and 4: Percenta | Coal Authority Reference Area? | | |
| Woolly or Parth Grade 1,2 and/or 3 Agricultural tand duality: Percentage of site in Flood 2 ane 3: Percentage of site in Flood 2 ane 1: Percentage of site sit in Be 300 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,00 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,00 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,00 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,00 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood 4 agr. Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood 4 agr. Percentage of the site within 20m of an of addetated river not flood 4 agr. Percentage of the site within 20m of a defented on the river of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defented river not river of the site within 20m of a defented river not river. All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt parcels covering the site which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels covering the site which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 2. The Green Belt Assessment and Strong performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Assessment and strong performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt assessment purpose 3. The Green Belt Assessment and strong performance against purpose 3. One of the Green Belt undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt purpose | , , , | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of Site in Flood and 2: The Green Belt Considerations: If on the CSS: In Green Belt Considerations (Residential) In Green Belt Considerations (Residential) In Green Belt Considerations (Residential) In | | | |
| Percentage of site in Flood 2 and 3: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruction flood vent: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruction flood vent: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defence of the 30m of a defence o | | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in Bload Zone 3: Percentage of the site in Eload Zone 4: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface Road in Stance: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Road in Stance: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Road in Stance: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Road in Stance: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Road in Stance: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Road Road Road Road Road Road Road Road | , | 7% | |
| Percentage of the six bin this all years surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six within 20m of on instance flood on the contional reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the six within 20m of on defence: Percentage of the six within 20m of on defence: Percentage of the six within 20m of on defence: Percentage of the six within 20m of on defence: Percentage of the six within 20m of on defence: Percentage of the six within 20m of on detailed rive network: All or port of the six within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. and 4, and moderate performance against purpose 3. with read to purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. one of the eyel of enconchment on countryside and the water and strong performance against purpose 3. and 4, and moderate performance ag | | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 years surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood whop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood depent: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood whop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood whop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood whop: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river and an additional service of the site within 20m of a detailed river and the site within 30m of a detailed river and the site within a Source Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruction of the site within three Green Belt percels of the site within three Green Belt percels of the within a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt percels if released for development, which within the weak ming of the role of adjoining area | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | |
| surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface (Pod risk zone: Percentage of the site intelliged on the Altoric Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instantin flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instantin flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an adelprace: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. And 4 and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Considerations: (fram the GB Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. and 4, and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt percelopment, would have a moderate-light and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encoachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the level of encoachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the level of purposes 3. One of the level of the purpose 4. Medium-Low and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Williamyo Network? Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Evisting Highway Viaulobe for Troffic Associated with the V | | 30% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instance flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed risk within 20m of a detailed river network: All or port of the site within a Source protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that thes Green Belt parcels which have moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if | | 1% | |
| surface (flood risk zone: Percentage of the site inte 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA instance flood May be within 20m of an historic flood develor: Percentage of the site identified on the EA instance flood May be within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site identified on the notional reservoir immobility of the site within 20m of a defence: Percentage of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-light and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-light and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-light and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, or the Wussiling of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, or the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, or the Wussiling of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, or the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, or the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, or the Green Belt parcels | , , | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m year suffice fload fix zone: Some suffice fload fix zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct, fload Moy: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct, fload within 12m of an instruct fload within 12m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-liph and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if re | | 2% | |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an actional reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a default river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment Interview) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt lates which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt lates which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt parcels of the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirely of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. **Londscape Considerations** (Residential) from the LVSS): **Londscape Considerations** (Residential) from the LVSS): **Medium and Medium High **Medium and M | | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct Pool Mags: Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct Pool Advance Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct Pool Advance Percentage of the site within 20m of an instruct Pool Advance Percentage of the site within 20m of an defonce: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or port of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt Assessment Indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels free Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt Assessment Indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels free Belt Bereated on the very which have an orderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard purposes 2. One Green Belt Considerations (Residential) (From the LVSS): Medium - LVSS): Medium - LVSS Medium - High And High Medium and Medium - High Medium - High and High Wellows Neuronal Medium - High and High Wellows Neuronal Medium - High and High Would be restricted. Profile Associated with the Velocates on the Research of the Secondary of the Secondary Profile Associated with the Velocates of the Mighway Neuronal Medium - Velocate Neuronal Medium - Veloc | | 5% | |
| Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site eightified on the autional reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site eightifing from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 0 Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels; which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels; which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Beview undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels (if released for development, would have a moderate high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels (if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels). The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels (if released for development, which have moderate performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Beview undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have a moderate performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt due to the level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, overing the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Admission of the Green Belt due to the level of parcels covering the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of parcels covering the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt due to the levels of harm on the Green Belt parcels, one of the Green Belt parcels, one of | | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage of the site within and mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Considerations: Green Belt Considerations (From the GB Assessment/Review) The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt barcels, if released for development, which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt barcels, if released for development, which have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels which we washing a many parcel (repr | | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the actional reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels which have moderate heigh and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encorablement on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt to the level of encorablement on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt to the level of encorablement on countryside and file weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt to the level of encorablement on the Green Belt which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt the USS): Medium and Medium-High Wisual impact Considerations (Employment) [from the USS]: Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Wisual impact Considerations (Employment) [from the USS]: Medium and Medium-High Wisual mapact Considerations Medium and Medium-High Wisual | - | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the notional reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detoiled river network: All or part of the site within 25urce Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels over the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt days a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of harmon the Green Belt use to the level of harmon the Green Belt use on the Wissiphore of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt under the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt with the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt with the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt with the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt under the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt with the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt was a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt under the weakening of the rol | Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels, which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. **Londscape Considerations (Residential)** [Indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development and the would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for th | historic flood event: | 0/8 | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels, which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which have moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. **Londscape Considerations (Residential)** [Indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development and the would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for th | Demonstrate of the city identified and the | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purpose 3. and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. one of the Green Belt parcels which have moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations (Residential) Ifrom the LVSS): Wall impact Considerations (Residential) Ifrom the LVSS): Medium-Low and Medium-High Medium-High and High Medium-High and High Medium-High and High Medium-High and High Wighway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Vieta Access to | | 23% | |
| defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: | Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Londscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Londscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Londscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway (Network? Highway Comments - IN No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. | 5 5 | 0% | |
| detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2. The Green Belt sheep within a Sub-parcel (representing the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site withis particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Visual impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Wedium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Fi No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. | • | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt the Green Belt the Green Belt have fore met parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Individual impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Medium-Low and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Medium-High and High Medium-High and High Y Wisa a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. | | 2% | |
| Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4, and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Visual impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Wedium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Wedium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. | | | |
| The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within three Green Belt parcels which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level of harm on the Green Belt. Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Medium and Medium-High Medium-High and High Wedium-High and High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Wisual Impact Considerations (Fighway Soultable for Traffic Associated with the | . , | Yes | |
| which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate high entered to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt arcels covering the strength of the role of the Green Belt arcels covering the strength of harm on the Green Belt arcels covering the strength of the role of the Green Belt arcels covering the strength of the role of the G | Protection Zone: | | |
| (from the LVSS):Medium-Low and MediumVisual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS):Medium and Medium-HighLandscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):Medium and Medium-HighVisual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS):Medium-High and HighHighway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?YHighway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted.Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with theY | (from the GB Assessment/Review) | which have moderate and strong performance against purposes 2 and 4; and moderate performance against purpose 3. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. One of the Green Belt parcels covering the site contains a sub-parcel (representing the entirety of the site within this particular parcel) which would have a moderate level | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Medium and Medium-High Y Wia a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. | (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low and Medium | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Wisual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Wia a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | | Medium and Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Wisual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Wia a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | , | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | | Medium and Medium-High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | , | | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | • | Medium-High and High | |
| Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | | | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | · , | Y | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane would be restricted. Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Y | - | Via a strategic link between Priorslee Road (link under railway bridge), A4169 and A464 but vehicular access onto Park Lane | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Can One Reasonably Be Achievea? And | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | now? | | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Highway Comments - Existing Highway | | |
| | | Υ | |
| | | | |
| | , | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | Highway Comments - If Fxisting Highway | | |
| at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Y. With appropriate junctions and speed limit reviews and extension and traffic calming on the radial routes. | | V. With appropriate junctions and speed limit reviews and extension and traffic calming on the radial routes | |
| Reasonably be Made So? | | 1. With appropriate junctions and speed little reviews and extension and traffic callling on the radial foutes. | |
| neusonably be wade 50! | neusonably be wade so: | | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | Highway Comments - Could the | | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site Y. | - | Υ. | |
| Works? | | | |
| | | | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Y. Assuming checks are made on any adverse impact on Innage Road and Church Street and associated junctions and | Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- | Y. Assuming checks are made on any adverse impact on Innage Road and Church Street and associated junctions and | |
| Site Works Achievable? N. Assuming checks are made on any adverse impact on image road and chariff street and associated junctions and mitigation provided if necessary. | | | |
| Tillugation provided it flecessary. | SILE VIOLKS ACHIEVUDIE! | illiugation provided it necessary. | |
| | | | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 19 |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Protection of ponds, Env. Network and GCNs will reduce the no. of houses possible. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Northern section: The northern boundary forms and Env. Network corridor (due to the presence of a vegetated railway line). This corridor should buffered and enhanced. Southern section: Wesley Brook runs through this site and a large buffer of riparian habitat forms an Env. Network corridor. An appropriately sized buffer will be required from the Env. Network with no development within. This could be POS. Part of the north-western and south-western boundaries contain or are adjacent to Env. Network corridors and priority habitat (woodland) - these will also need to be appropriately buffered. There are GCN breeding ponds adjacent to the site. Retention and protection of the ponds (with appropriate buffers) will reduce the no. of houses possible. Given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area, a large amount of mitigation land is likely to be required, particularly in the south-eastern section of the site. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish, invertebrates and nesting birds. Hedgerows, trees and ponds will need to be buffered. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II listed Shifnal Manor (The Manor House - NHLE ref. 1176147), setting of Grade II listed house known as The Terrace (NHLE ref. 1053636) and cluster of associated Grade II LBs at Shifnal Manor. Site itself includes putative, but now largely discounted, site of Idsall (pre-1590 Shifnal - HER PRN 00757) and site of a 17th century mill pond. Site also includes a former brickworks (HER PRN 01825). Site includes non-designated historic buildings at Lodgehill Farm. Large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPOs adjacent site |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | belt of woodland to north of site along railway and group of trees in semi-natural habitat along watercourse in centre of site |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development. Expand woodland cover along northern boundary and expand buffer along watercourse with a development stand-off |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Multiple noise sources including A4169 which will require noise assessment to ensure internal standards with windows open are achieved and impact on and from existing farm business off Park Lane marked as Lodghill farm. Brook known to flood. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Noise survey, orientation, layout, standoff and working with existing business. Farm building use will likely be disturbing to residents. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 137 |

| Strategic Considerations: | that runs into the western portion of site P15b of similar character running to Park Lane. The site then comprises individual sites to the west with P16 forming the land around the south of Lodgehill Farm and on the lower slopes of Lodge Hill and site SHF017 (south) forming the land around the north of Lodgehill Farm and along the woodland boundary to the urban edge of town, crossing the corridor of the Wesley Brook and fronting the A4169. Site SHF07 (north) continues to the north of the A4169 forming a gently sloping, open greenfield site adjoining the open urban edge of town and the green corridor along the railway embankment to the west of the town. of the west. These combined sites provide an extended development opportunity between the A464 Wolverhampton Road and the A4169 and would present a future opportunity to under pass the railway and link to the A464 west. These sites are located in the Green Belt where they serve to prevent urban development encroaching into the countryside and separate Shifnal from adjoining towns. The release of this land form the Green Belt would have a moderate-high harm to the Green Belt for sites SHF017 and P16. The local topography screens sites SHF019 and P15b west behind a ridgeline where the harm of release would be moderate. The landscape effects on the western parcels are medium-high lying below Lodge Hill but this screens the sites where the visual impact would be medium. To the east, the landscape impacts are medium and the visual impacts are medium-high where the land is open to views from the south and east but sites SHF019 and P15b west have the benefit of concealment behind the ridgeline. The land area is affected by the flood risks around the Wesley brook with its constrained watercourse through he town capable of being addressed by a roadway viaduct across the river channel and the creation of a Green Infrastructure network along the watercourse potentially to include public open space with equipped play space. There is a further risk of surface water flooding t | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect the land north of the rail line within the Green Belt The extended area of land south of the rail line and extending though the A4169 and up to the A464 (south) to be removed from the Green Belt and safeguard for future development | |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal that combine these sites to form SHF034 and contribute to a large scale housing development to meet the future needs of Shifnal. This would create a continuous link road between the two principal highways at A4169 and A464 to reduce congestion on the highway network through the town and locally on the constrained country lane at Park Lane. The release of SHF034 is considered to be justified to provide for the future neds of Shifnal delivering new strategic infrastructure investment, new housing opportunities, new community facilities and commercial services for the residents of the town and building on proposed highway improvements at Five Ways and Innage Road. The provision of new strategic highway to the A4169 and into site SHF017 (north) north of the A4169 Bridgnorth Road will facilitate the longer term provision of a roadway underpass linking the A464 west to create the potential for a one way gyratory system via the under-pass onto the A464 and to return through the 'sister' under-pass at Innage Road. These land parcel may accommodate employment development within the broad range of land uses on site SHF034 however, the release of sites SHF018b and SHF018d will meet the longer term needs for employment in the town and so, employment is not currently recommended as an option for SHF034. | |
| | i | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| City Assessment Change 2 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | CUITODE. | |
| Site Reference: | SHF035 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | Yes | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 00/ | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| · | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 0% | |
| historic flood event: | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 14% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% | |
| defence: | U/0 | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 00/ | |
| detailed river network: | 0% | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | | |
| Protection Zone: | Yes | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | Within the Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire this site is considered within two Green Belt parcels (P15 and BA2). The assessment indicates that these parcels make no contribution against purposes 1a and 1b; perform moderately against purpose 2 and purpose 4; and performs either moderately or strongly against purpose 3. Within the Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire the element of the site located within P15 is considered, however Parcel BA2 (which contains a large portion of the site) was not specifically assessed. The review of parcel P15 indicates that there would be moderate-high harm to the Green Belt resulting from release (although a sub-parcel containing a small portion of this site would have moderate harm to the Green Belt if released). Within the Green Belt Review, the element of the site within parcel P15 is also considered within sub-opportunity area (Sh-1 and Sh-2), furthermore a sub-area of the parcel is also considered within opportunity area Sh-1a. The review of opportunity areas Sh-1 and Sh-2 indicates that there would be high harm to the Green Belt resulting from release. The review of sub-opportunity areas Sh-1a indicates that there would be moderate harm to the Green Belt resulting from release. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) | Medium-Low | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): | <u> </u> | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | High | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | | |
| How? | | |
| Highway Comments Evistina Highway | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | The site has three existing highway access points. Two of the existing accesses are on to minor roads, Lamledge Lane and | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | | |
| Development at the Access Point? | Upton Lane with restricted width and forward visibility. Therefore, access to the site without improvements to Lamledge | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Lane and Upton Lane would need to be via the A464. The Development would provide an opportunity to upgrade the existing Junction on to the A464. Upton Crossroads is an Accident Cluster site due to the high approach speeds and restricted visibility for vehicles emerging on to the A464. The site appears to include land that would enable these improvements to be delivered if needed. If developed as a strategic site it is assumed that local services / facilities would be provided within a master plan that gave | |
| Highway Comments - Could the | priority to sustainable modes of transport for local trips to these facilities. The nearest schools is St Andrews Primary School | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | | |
| Works? | which is approximately 2km from the centre of the site and are linked by a continuous footway, which would require | |
| | upgrading. The nearest convenience store and GP is in Shifnal Town Centre are approximately 2.5km from the centre of the | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | site and are linked by a continuous footway. | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | | |
|---|--|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | HRA may be required for any employment use that generates airborne pollution or road traffic including HGVs. Detailed emissions modelling would be required due to proximity of designated wildlife sites. See LPR HRA. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | There is a patch of priority habitat woodland on the site that is TPO'd and within the Env. Network. This area should be retained and appropriately buffered. The eastern and southern boundaries form Env. Network corridors. There is a pond within the woodland and many others within 500m Requires an Kecia and surveys for bats, GCN (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments | | |
| Opportunities: Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | No known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological potential. Site detached from existing built edge of town, so development likely to be incongruous in relation to the semi-rural character of the immediate surroundings. | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | Trees and groups of trees and hedgerows associated with large ponds to the west of the site. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Ensure appropriate development stand-off from trees and woodland. | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Incorporate good trees and tree groups as part of open space within development and plan strategically for a network of connected green infrastructure. Look to connect to / expand block of woodland to the west of the site. | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Noise from road to south and rail to north. Potential contaminated land (not had access to systems to check on this aspect). Possible odour from farm buildings close to edge of site. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Remediation likely to be available for contaminated land. Appropriate assessments will be necessary. Noise mitigation likely to be available. As a first option it is recommended that noise sensitive receptors (residential properties) are provided with sufficient distance from noise sources to avoid issues. Where this is not possible good design and layout including orientation and layout of development, glazing barriers including fencing and bunding, mechanical ventilation. Odour concerns can be reduced by having separation distance from odour sources and where possible not placing residential down wind from odour sources. | |
| Public Protection Comments | | |
| Opportunities: Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability | | |
| Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 141 | |

| | open ridgeline running north towards the rail line enclosing two large man made but naturalising ponds within parcel P15 and open land sloping downwards to the east into the Green Belt as part of BA2. This second area includes a third agricultural pond with a dedicated highway access from Upton Lane which itself is located in the centre west of the land. Parcel P15 adjoins proposed housing allocations SHF023 and SHF022 on the south west boundary will become part of the built form of the town. To the north up to the rail line, the land is partially separated from the built form of Shifnal by the exclusion of sites P15a and SHF023(north) with the important local route of Lamledge Lane that forms a local road viaduct over the rail line and leads into the north and centre of the town and passes Shifnal Industrial Estate. This route, more than Upton Lane, provides direct access to the town by means other than private motor vehicles. The two areas of P15 and BA2 combined provide an extended development opportunity served from the A464 to provide for the future housing needs of Shifnal. This proposed areas for housing would have direct access to the proposed new employment area on Upton Lane to the north of the rail line to help create a sustainable development option to the east of Shifnal. The road viaduct of Upton Lane over the rail line is proposed to be closed with the development of an employment area on sites SHF018b and SHF018d and to maintain this road route would require investment in Upton Lane and the road viaduct over the rail line. The sites are located in the Green Belt where they serve to prevent urban development encroaching into the countryside and help protect the setting to this historic town. The release of this land from the Green Belt would have a moderate-high harm to the Green Belt for parcel P15. This has a more complicated set of relationships when considering sub-opportunity areas and the fact that BA2 was not assessed in the Green Belt Review. The assessment of sub-opportunity areas indica | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the future development needs of the community than this greenfield land in the open countryside that makes an important contribution to the Green Belt. These other sites have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In contrast site SHF035 would extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout extending directly into the Green belt and with a partial separation from the built form of the town. The release of this land would have significant impacts on the town's setting and the protection of the Green Belt. These reasons indicate that SHF035 should not be preferred as the safeguarded land to meet the future development needs of Shifnal. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site Reference: | SHF037 | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 2% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 24 | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 2% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 270 | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 201 | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | U/0 | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within two Green Belt parcels which have moderate performance against purpose 2; moderate and strong performance against purpose 3; and weak and no contribution against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that these Green Belt parcels, if released for development, would have a moderate-high and high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Y | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Stanton Road and Coppice Green Lane | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit on Stanton Road but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction possibly roundabout. This site should not have highway (vehicular) access onto Coppice Green Land unless major improvements can be delivered in the wider network. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. As the impact of this development Coppice Green Lane, Aston Street and Curriers Lane and associated junctions would not be accommodated and only reduced by the establishment of a strategic circular road to provide alternative access routes. This would be prevented by existing development to the north west and the need to secure agreements with third party landowners to the south. | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 18 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Protection of adjacent ponds and Env. Network will reduce the no. of houses possible. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site contains patches of woodland (Env. Network and potential priority habitats). These areas should be retained and appropriately buffered. There are pons adjacent to the site. Retention and protection of the ponds (with appropriate buffers) will reduce the no. of houses possible. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows, trees and ponds will need to be buffered. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | Land N of Stanton Lane likely to have substantial negative impact on setting of Grade II* Aston Hall (NHLE ref. 1308059) and associated cluster of GII LBs. | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | For land S of Stanton Rd this area also has a poor relationship with existing built form of settlement. No known archaeological interest but large size of site suggests it may have some potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPO adjacent site | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | site contains numerous hedgerows and trees and a strip of mature woodland along the northern boundary. Site adjoins several blocks of mature woodland | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development. Seek to expand adjoining woodlands with new woodland creation as part of open space within the development. | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Multiple noise sources including main roads out of Shifnal and M54, rail line and Lamledge lane industrial site (the latter being a source of other dis-amenity issues). Potential contaminated land close to Lamledge lane industrial site. The area close to M54 more appropriate for employment. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Areas close to M54 unsustainable for housing. Multiple noise assessments required. All should be assessed for windows open which will lead to thoughtful orientation, glazing and positioning of habitable rooms. Consider flatted developments near rail line. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Good | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 145 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | of open greenfield sites spanning the land around the north and north east of Shifnal within the Green Belt and seeking to provide a sustainable extension to Shifnal to meet the future development needs for housing on site SHF018a whose proposed development is addressed below. The sustainable extension also addressed the employment needs of Shifnal on sites SHF018b and SHF018d and he evidence for these sites was accepted they are now proposed to be allocated for employment use. Site SHF018a proposed for housing development is a very large, elevated greenfield site (80ha) is situated to the north-east of Shifnal adjoining Stanton Road (south) and Coppice Green Lane (west). The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release. Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and traffic calming measures. However, development of SHF018c would need to restrict vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity which may be difficult to achieve. The site lies in the countryside but has few significant features which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium and but is elevated with a number of open aspects providing medium-high visual sensitivity. The site has no flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees and hedgerows within and around the site with woodland at its southern boundary which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. The site lies in the setting of listed buildings (Grade II) requiring a Heritage Assessment including an archaeological assessment. The site has a | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | Yes - southern portion only to be removed from the Green belt and allocated for employment development | |
| Recommendation | Protect the land north of Stanton Road within the Green Belt The land to the south around Upton Lane from Stanton Road (north) to the rail line (south) to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment development | |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the future development needs of the community than this greenfield land in the open countryside that makes an important contribution to the Green Belt. These other sites have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In contrast site SHF037 would extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout removing a strong boundary to the Green Belt at Coppice Green Lane. The land is elevated above and visible from the built form of the town and forms the setting and backdrop to the Grade II* listed Aston Hall. The release of this land would have significant impacts on the setting of the town and its key heritage assets, the protection of the Green Belt and the capacity of the highway network in the north-east and retail core of the town. These reasons indicate that SHF037 should not be preferred as the safeguarded land to meet the future development needs of Shifnal. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | | |
| Capacity: | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Reference: | P10 | |
|---|---|--|
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | 163 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| | 20/ | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 3% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 3% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 97% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 4% | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 470 | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 4% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 7% | |
| | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% | |
| Historic Flood Map: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | 3% | |
| historic flood event: | 3.0 | |
| Paraantaga of the site identified on the | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 16% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| defence: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | | |
| | 9% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | .55 | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs strongly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release for development would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 2 to separate adjoining towns and the level of encroachment on the setting of the town under purpose 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| | Wedulii | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) | | |
| (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): | | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations | Medium Medium-High Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Medium Medium-High Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Medium Medium-High Medium-High | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and footways. | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site | Medium Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the | Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and footways. | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and footways. | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and footways. Y If developed as a strategic site then a review of several major junctions would be needed, including M54 junction 4 and the | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and footways. | |
| (from the LVSS): Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Medium-High Medium-High Y Priorslee Road, Haughton Lane and unnamed road to the west of Haughton Road Y Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along the three frontage roads, including speed limits and footways. Y If developed as a strategic site then a review of several major junctions would be needed, including M54 junction 4 and the | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 18 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Significant reduction in no. of houses due to presence of Env. Network/potential priority habitats/woodland/protected species. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site may contain priority grassland and woodland habitats - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then these areas should not be developed. There are otter, water vole and badger records on the site. Wesley Brook runs through this site and a large buffer of riparian habitat forms an Env. Network corridor. An appropriately sized buffer will be required from the Env. Network with no development within. This could be POS. If GCNs are present in the on-site ponds, a min. 50m buffer is likely to be required. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (trees and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish, invertebrates and nesting birds. There are a number of TPOs on the site. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | If priority habitats are present, these areas should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Site partially within Haughton Conservation Area. Probable impact on setting of Grade II* listed Haughton Hall. Site includes non-designated parkland for Haughton Hall (HER PRN 07526). Site includes cluster of non-designated historic buildings at Banks Farm. Very large size and numerous metal detectorist finds suggests it has archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on character and appearance of CA and non-designated parkland; setting of LBs; Level 2 Historic Buildings Assessment; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | surrounds Haughton village conservation area. Numerous tree, group, area and woodland TPO designations in southern half of site. Large linear woodland and water features run through central part of site , linking to Haughton Hall | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and trees within and around site boundaries | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | due to size of site - full EIA and landscape character assessment and VIA. At a smaller scale - Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | use 20% canopy cover policy to plant trees and woodland within site. large area of land so affords opportunity to integrate existing trees and groups of trees within a matrix of open space and natural habitat. Expand woodland where feasible. | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Road noise to north and south and noise from service station to the west. Historic landfill on site. Possible noise from events at Haughton Hall(?) | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. Con land remediation may be available. Suggest stay away from western tip of the site. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor Page 149 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, gently sloping greenfield site is situated to the west of Shifnal adjoining the A464 Priorslee Road (south) and Haughton Lane (east). The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release where the primary objectives are to protect the setting of the town and the separation from Telford, more than encroachment into the countryside. Accessibility to Haughton Lane would provide an appropriate highway access subject to detailed assessment of further highway improvements at the Five Ways roundabout and Priorslee Road. The site adjoins the edge of the built form of the town which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium and despite its open aspect, forms part of a parcel with medium visual sensitivity. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site would require an Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to help sustain the site character and its function as part of the Environmental Network. The presence of any priority habitat may reduce the developable area to permit the restoration and enhancement of the habitat. The site has significant tree and woodland cover recognised through Tree Protection Orders requiring detailed assessment of the value of the site. The site lies in / close to Haughton Village Conservation Area and in the setting of listed and non-designated heritage assests requiring a detailed Heritage Assessment. The site has a Poor sustainability rating due to the distance from Shifnal's facilities and the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this greenfield site in the open countryside that makes an important contribution to the Green Belt. These other sites have a better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In contrast site P10 would extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout and would have significant impacts on the town's setting and its infrastructure particularly its highway network whilst potentially compromising the open character and environmental values of site P10. These reason would suggest that P10 should not be developed and the degree of harm from employment uses would be even greater than that likely to be caused by housing use. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | P14 |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 1% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 2% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% |
| defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: | Yes |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs moderately against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and weakly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release of the land would have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purposes 2 and 3. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Visual Impact Considerations | Medium-High |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): Highway Comments - Direct Access to | γ |
| Highway Network? | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Stanton Road |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | N |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended with traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction possibly roundabout with SHF018c. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | N. The collective impact of the developments off Stanton Road will have an unacceptable impact on Aston Street and Curriers Lane and associated junctions which are already at or close to capacity. |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 17 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. Developable area greatly reduced due to presence of ponds/woodland/Env. Network. | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The site may contain priority woodland and grassland habitats - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. There are ponds on and in close proximity to the site. If GCNs are present in any of the ponds, a min. 50m buffer will be required. If GCNs aren't present, the ponds (priority habitat) and associated habitats should be retained and enhanced, with connectivity maintained, which will greatly reduce the developable area available. The site lies forms an Env. Network corridor. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (trees, buildings and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | If priority habitats are present, these areas should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II* listed Aston Hall (NHLE ref. 1308059) and cluster of associated Grade II LBs. Site includes a former 19th century brick field (HER PRN 07291), and otherwise of a large size, so has archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | large blocks of woodland to centre and south of site restrict developable space to fields to north and east of site | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedges and trees around site boundaries | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees. | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Ensure development stand-off from existing woodland and expand if possible, linking the woodland areas. | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Commercial/industrial to the south. Road to the north. Potential con land from infilled ponds on site. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | Advise stay away from commercial/industrial to south leaving good distance to stop interference with the existing site. Con land remediation likely to be available. | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Good Page 153 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, undulating greenfield site (14ha) is situated to the east of Shifnal adjoining Stanton Road (north) and Shifnal Industrial Estate (south). The land is located within the Green Belt with a moderate-high harm caused by its release however, Green Belt parcels to the north would have a higher impact on the remaining Green Belt land. Stanton Road would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and traffic calming measures. However, development of SHF018b would need to restrict vehicle movements into Aston Street, Curriers Lane and highway junctions close to/exceeding their capacity. The site lies in the countryside which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium-high and despite its enclosed nature has medium-high visual sensitivity. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site would require an Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to help sustain the site character and its function as part of the Environmental Network. The presence of any priority habitat may reduce the developable area to permit the restoration and enhancement of the habitat. The site has large blocks of woodland restricting development in the centre and south of the site. Possible impact on setting of Grade II* listed Aston Hall and cluster of associated Grade II Listed Buildings. The site also includes a former 19th century brick field and is large, so has archaeological potential. As such a Heritage Assessment will be required. The site would have limited accessibility to Shifnal's facilities to redress the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and safeguard for future development | |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. Site P14 offers the potential to safeguard land to support the long term growth of a large scale, new employment area to the east of Shifnal. This potential employment area would have the benefit of access to Stanton Road and the potential to route commercial traffic away the town and towards the M54 at Junction 3 and the secondary route along the A41. The safeguarding of site P14 (with SHF018a), in proximity to existing and newly allocated employment activities around Stanton Road / Lamledge Lane has the capacity to support the employment needs of the town in combination with sites SHF108b and SHF18d. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity: | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | | |
|---|---|--|
| Site Reference: | P15a | |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No No | |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No | |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% | |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 100/0 | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 2% | |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 5% | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | | |
| historic flood event: | 0% | |
| mstoric flood event. | | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | U% | |
| Descentage of the site benefitting from | | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% | |
| defence: | | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% | |
| detailed river network: | | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes | |
| Protection Zone: | | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would also have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. However, Site P15a has an identified sub-parcel which would have a moderate level of harm if released from the Green Belt. | |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High | |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium | |
| Visual Impact Considerations | | |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): | High | |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | | |
| Highway Network? | Υ | |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Lamledge La and Upton La | |
| How? | | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N | |
| Development at the Access Point? | | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | N. This site (540 homes) should not have highway (vehicular) access onto Lamledge Lane or Upton Road unless major improvements can be delivered along the whole length of both lanes and this would require significant amount of third party land. | |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Υ | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | | |

| Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and Env/ Network/woodland. If priority habitats are present, development is not recommended. The site forms an Env. Network corridor. The site forms an Env. Network corridor. The site forms an Env. Network corridor. The site may contain priority grassland habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the should not be developed. This site looks like it contains some excellent quality GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat. There are GCN breeding pond 150m from the boundary. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting bird The woodland and hedgerows will need to be retained and appropriately buffered. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitat mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priorit habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD1: Coology Comments Opportunities: Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. Heritage Comments |
|--|
| The site may contain priority grassland habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the should not be developed. This site looks like it contains some excellent quality GCN and reptile terrestrial habitat. There are GCN breeding pond 150m from the boundary. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting bird. The woodland and hedgerows will need to be retained and appropriately buffered. Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitat 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 MD1: Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat Opportunities: Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| Management of Constraints: 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 MD1. Ecology Comments Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat Opportunities: Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| Opportunities: Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| |
| Significant Constraints: |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: Site includes a widening of the railway cutting (HER PRN 29639) opposite the former Coalport China and Wire Works PRN 07289). No other known archaeological interest but site is of a large size, so may have some archaeological pote |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: block of woodland and group of trees to northern edge of site and mature trees and hedges around and within site. |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method State |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and any future woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the existing and cover and create 15m buffer w |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: Factory on site to the north east creating possible noise etc and possible contamination to the land. Rail to the north industrial estate to the opposite side. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings to the road. However to the nature of the industrial estate to the north significant stand off may be necessary. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): Poor |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): Page 157 |

| Strategic Considerations: | This larger, relatively flat greenfield site is situated on the south-eastern edge of Shifnal adjoining the railway line east of the town and opposite Shifnal Industrial estate. The site is served from the north by Lamledge Lane across a narrow road bridge over the railway and from the east by the country lane of Upton Lane. These two highways are not suitable to serve development on P15a unless improved along the entire length of the roadways serving the site. The site would therefore benefit from an alternative access such as might be achieved through the development of the entire area of the adjoining site SHF023. The site lies close to the built form of the town principally comprising the employment area of Shifnal Industrial Estate to the north across the rail line. The land area comprises a sub-parcel of Green Belt land considered for release with a moderate effect on its release on the remaining Gren Belt land. The land has some evidence of use in connection with the railway which influences its landscape sensitivity (medium-low) but the land has an open aspect with a higher visual sensitivity (medium-high). The site has little known flood risk (Flood Zone 1) but a nominal surface water risk in severe conditions. The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain its function in the Environmental Network. The presence of priority habitat may also reduce the developable area to a degree. The site requires an archaeological assessment to explore the scale of the site including known historical railway excavations on the land. The site has mature tree and hedgerow boundaries and mature trees and woodland to the north which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. Proximity to the railway and Shifnal Industrial Estate indicates the potential for nuisances requiring a design solution in any | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this more isolated greenfield site in the Green Belt. It is recognised that the site makes only a moderate contribution to the Green Belt but it is currently situated in a relatively inaccessible location along with northern portion of adjacent site SHF023. There other sites with better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In contrast site P15a and the northern section of SHF023 would extend the settlement well beyond its current built form and layout. This land may become more accessible and suitable for development should the proposed development of land at SHF022 and SHF023(south) provide an access solution across the Revell's Rough woodland but this is not likely to happen for some time. This land is not suited to employment development despite the proximity to Shifnal Industrial Estate as the land lies in a relatively isolated location with very poor accessibility via the existing highway network, the close proximity to some existing and newly proposed housing development and the sensitivities to landscape | |
| | (medium) and visual (high) impacts which are greater than for housing development. | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | P15b |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | No No |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 100/0 |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| nistoric Jiood event: | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | COV |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 6% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | 0% |
| defence: | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | 0% |
| detailed river network: | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes |
| Protection Zone: | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the level of encroachment on countryside and the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 3. However, P15b partly lies in an identified sub-parcel which would have a lower, moderate level of harm if released from the Green Belt. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-Low |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium |
| (from the LVSS): | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Western Portion: Onto Park Lane. Eastern Portion: Onto A464 |
| 110111 | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | N |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Western Portion: N. Unless access can be gain access to A464 via SH015 and/or SHF019. Eastern Portion: Y. Outside 30mph limit but this can be extended but will need traffic calming / gateway feature. Consideration should be given to a shared main road junction with other sites off the A464. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | Y |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | Western Portion: 16 Eastern Portion: 18 |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | There is a pond on the site in which GCNs are likely to be present. There is a GCN breeding pond adjacent to the north-east boundary. A buffer of at least 50m around the ponds are likely to be required, but this may be higher given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. Opportunity to greatly increase habitat available and connectivity for GCNs. |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Probable impact on setting of Grade II listed house known as The Terrace (NHLE ref. 1053636). Site also includes a former brickworks (HER PRN 01825). Large size of site also suggests it may have other archaeological potential. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, archaeological DBA + field evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedges, mature trees and groups of trees within and around site. Unnatural block of plantation in centre of south-eastern part of site. |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and use good site layout and design to ensure significant trees are successfully incorporated into and add value to the development. Opportunity to create larger area of publicly accessible woodland, extending and reshaping existing block of woodland |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Road to the north and southwest of the site creating a noise source. Possible contamination to north west of site from past land use. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and Contamination likely to be able to be remediated. Orientation of dwellings to the road. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Poor |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Poor Page 161 |

| Strategic Considerations: | This split greenfield site (18ha) is situated to the south-east of Shifnal adjoining the A464 Wolverhampton Road but the main part of the site is poorly related to the built form of the town. However, the smaller parcel located to the west on Park Lane offers the potential to conduct an access road to the A464 from other parcels to the west to reduce traffic impacts on the constrained Park Lane. The land is located within the Green Belt with a moderate-high harm caused by its release. However, the eastern parcel may have a lower moderate harm due to its relative position adjacent to the ridgeline south of the site. The western site adjoins the built form of the town with a lower landscape sensitivity (medium-low) but the land retains a higher visual sensitivity (medium-high). The site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1). The site requires some Ecological Assessment and an Arboricultural Assessment. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature tree and hedgerow cover within and around the site which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. Possible impact on Grade II listed building. The site also includes a former brickworks and due is large so has archaeological potential. As such a Heritage Assessment will be required. Proximity to the A464 indicates a potential noise nuisance requiring a design solution in any development. The site has a Poor sustainability rating for the eastern parcel due to the distance from Shifnal's facilities and the environmental values of the site, the western parcel might be considered more sustainable and in combination with site SHF019 with good accessibility to the A464 this smaller sub-parcel has a Fair sustainability rating under site SHF019VAR. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect the land east up to Hinnington Road within the Green Belt but release the western land between SHF019 (north) and Park Lane (south) from the Green Belt and safeguard for future development | |
| Reasoning | The main part of P15b located to the east comprises a greenfield site in the open countryside that makes an important contribution to the Green Belt as it largely forms a ridgeline that is visible to the wider Green Belt but serves to enclose Shifnal from these long distance views. In relation to the larger part of P15b, there are more preferable sites available within Shifnal offering better opportunities to meet the needs of the community. A marginal part of P15b located to the west and closer to the built form of the town, has potential with SHF019 to provide a highway access to Park Lane from the A464 (south). In this way, P15b (west) could contribute to a larger scale release of land from the Green Belt with sites P16 and SHF017 (excluding P17b). This would create a continuous link road between the two principal highways at A464 and A4169 to remove traffic from the highway network through the town and from the country lane at Park Lane. This would require related highway improvements at Five Ways and Innage Road but it would permit the provision of a range of housing opportunities to meet local needs and to improve the provision of community facilities and commercial services for existing and new residents of the town. SHF034 might accommodate employment development within the larger scale land release in SHF034 to the south and west of the town. However, the release of sites SHF018b and SHF018d will meet the longer term needs for employment in the town and so, employment is not currently recommended as an option in relation to P15b (west) as part of the combined sites that form SHF034. | |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 Site Reference: P16 Coal Authority Reference Area? Yes Mineral Safeguarding Area? Yes Agricultural Land Quality: Yes Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: 6% Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: 94% Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Yercentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood went: Yercentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood vent: Yercentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Yercentage of the site within 20m of an detailed river network: Yercentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: Yes The Green Belt Considerations: (If released for the site within a Source Yes The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parce, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parce, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt parce, if released for development would have a moderat |
|--|
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 1: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Fload Wap: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Fload event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defauled river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Considerations: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Fload Wap: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Fload event: Percentage of the site identified on the nistoric fload event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-hig |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate-high level of the Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt Review undertates that this Gr |
| Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defance: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defance: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defance: Percentage of the site within 3 Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate-high level of has an mode |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this fire development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate-high level of has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate-high level of has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of has a moderate perfor |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of here. |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of here. |
| surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of here. |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of here. |
| historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her protection for the site within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her protection for the site within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her protection for the site within a Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her protection for the site within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her protection for the site within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal shropshire indicates that this green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her protection for the pr |
| historic flood event: Percentage of the site identified on the national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her process of the site within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her process of the site within a Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her process of the site within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her process of the site within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her process of the site within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of her process of the site within a Green Belt Parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 4. The Green Belt Parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 4. The Green Belt Parcel has a moderate performance against ea |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of here. |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of here. |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| defence: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Protection Zone: The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GR Assessment/Review) has a moderate performance against each of purpose 2; purpose 3; and purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertal Shropshire indicates that this Green Belt parcel, if released for development would have a moderate-high level of h |
| regard to purpose 3. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): Medium-Low and Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) Medium-High and Medium |
| (from the LVSS): |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) Medium and Medium-High |
| (from the LVSS): |
| Visual Impact Considerations |
| (Employment) (from the LVSS): |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to |
| Highway Network? |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And Park Lane |
| |
| How? |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the |
| Development at the Access Point? |
| Section at the fields forth. |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Assumes the site can fund improvements to Park Lane along the frontage for vehicles and pedestrians with land from the site, including extension of existing speed limit. |
| Highway Comments - Could the |
| |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| |
| Works? |
| |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- N. Park Lane to the north of the site is narrow with substandard footways and the site could not delivery necess |
| |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 14 |
|---|---|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | Reduction in no. of houses due to presence of GCNs and Env. Network. |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | Wesley Brook runs through the western section of the site - this an its associated riparian habitat forms an Env. Network corridor. An appropriately sized buffer will be required from the Env. Network with no development within. This could be POS. There is a GCN breeding pond on the site. A buffer of at least 50m around the pond will be required, but given the number of known GCN breeding ponds in the area, a greater amount of mitigation land is likely to be required. There are white-clawed crayfish records in the brook. Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats (trees, buildings and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish, invertebrates and nesting birds. A PROW runs through the site. |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on cluster of Grade II listed buildings at Shifnal Manor. Site includes non-designated historic buildings at Lodgehill Farm. No known archaeological interest but very large size suggest it may have archaeological potential. |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (Impact on settings of LBs; Level 2 Historic Buildings Assessment; archaeological desk based assessment + evaluation). |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and isolated trees within and around site boundaries. Area of woodland at western end of site |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Seek to link to / expand offsite woodland to the west |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Road noise to east. Possible con land. |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. Con land remediation may be available. |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 165 |

| Strategic Considerations: Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | This large, undulating greenfield site is situated to the south of Shifnal adjoining SHF017 and Park Lane which is severely constrained by current traffic usage. The land is located within the Green Belt with a moderate-high harm caused by its release however, of the parcels considered in the Green Belt Review the release of P16 has a lower impact on the remaining Green Belt land. Accessibility to the land from the west via SHF017 from the B4169 would be acceptable but an alternative eastern link would be required to intersect Park Lane. The site partly adjoins the built form of the town which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium-low however the land remains visible in the wider landscape with medium-high visual sensitivities. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) except for the corridor of the Wesley Brook and has a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions however, the topography may expose the land to inundation which requires a detailed flood risk assessment. The site requires Ecological Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment and a Botanical Survey. The presence of protected or priority species close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain its function in the Environmental Network. The presence of priority habitat may also reduce the developable area of the land. The site has woodland at its western end which should be retained or any removal mitigated by compensatory planting. The site lies in the setting of listed buildings (Grade II) requiring a Heritage Assessment including archaeological assessment. Proximity to the A464 indicates a potential noise nuisance requiring a design solution in any development. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road t |
|--|--|
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Remove land from Green Belt and safeguard for future development |
| Reasoning | A number of Green Belt sites when taken in combination may provide a strategic opportunity to meet the longer term development needs of Shifnal. Site P16 has the potential to provide an access from SHF017 to the A464 (south) and contribute to a large scale housing development with sites SHF015b(west), SHF019. This would create a continuous link road between the two principal highways at A4169 and A464 and remove any traffic burden on the country road at Park Lane. P16 has the benefit of having medium to medium-low landscape sensitivity but this has to be balanced with the medium to medium-high visual sensitivity and moderate-high harm to the Green Belt from its release for development. This balance relates to the potential benefits of delivering a new strategic link from the A4169 to the A464(south) in combination with sites SHF017, SHF15b(west) and SHF019, related highway improvements at Five Ways and Innage Road, provision of a range of housing opportunities to meet local needs and to improve the provision of community facilities and commercial services for existing and new residents of the town. The provision of a strategic highway junction to the A4169 is also considered to present the opportunity to develop site P17b north of Bridgnorth Road in combination with site P17a |
| | (Priorslee Road) north of the rail line however, releasing these land parcels would cause high harm to the Green Belt. This will further contribute to the long term provision of new housing and create the opportunity for a one way gyratory system via the railway under-pass between these two land parcels and using the separate under-pass on Innage Road. SHF034 might accommodate employment development within the larger scale land release in SHF034 to the south and west of the town. However, the release of sites SHF018b and SHF018d will meet the longer term needs for employment in the town and so, employment is not currently recommended as an option in relation to P15b (west) with SHF034. |
| If proposed for Allocation, Potential | will further contribute to the long term provision of new housing and create the opportunity for a one way gyratory system via the railway under-pass between these two land parcels and using the separate under-pass on Innage Road. SHF034 might accommodate employment development within the larger scale land release in SHF034 to the south and west of the town. However, the release of sites SHF018b and SHF018d will meet the longer term needs for employment in the town |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | P17a |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | Yes |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 | 100 |
| Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 1% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year | |
| surface flood risk zone: | 2% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | |
| Historic Flood Map: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an | |
| historic flood event: | 0% |
| | |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | 0% |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 570 |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from | |
| defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| | |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes |
| Protection Zone: | |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs strongly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release for development would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 2 to separate adjoining towns and the level of encroachment on the setting of the town under purpose 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) | Medium-High |
| (from the LVSS): | |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to | |
| | Υ |
| Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, | |
| | Deioveloo Dood |
| Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And | Priorslee Road |
| How? | |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway | |
| Suitable for Traffic Associated with the | Υ |
| Development at the Access Point? | |
| · | |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assumes that the site would fund any necessary improvements along Priorslee Road, including speed limits and footways. |
| Highway Comments - Could the | |
| Development Occur Without Off-Site | Υ |
| Works? | |
| | |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | Scale of developed may require a review of several major junctions, including M54 junction 4 and the Priorslee Road / Victoria Road / Shrewsbury Road roundabout and any necessary improvements funded. |
| | |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 19 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | The northern boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. This should be enhanced. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (trees, buildings and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. There are TPOs in the site boundaries. A PROW runs along the western boundary. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Potential impacts on setting of Grade II* listed Haughton Hall (NHLE ref 1176282) associated non-designated parkland (HER PRN 07526). Site includes cluster of non-designated historic buildings at Haughton Farm. Very large size and numerous metal detectorist finds suggests it has archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (Impact on setting of LBs and non-designated parkland; Level 2 Historic Buildings Assessment; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | TPO to line of trees at north-east corner of site | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and groups of trees within and around site., notably around cricket pitch and cemetery / allotments | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Seek to link to / expand linear woodland along railway embankment | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Rail noise to south, road noise to north. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 169 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This smaller, gently sloping greenfield site is situated to the west of Shifnal between the A464 Priorslee Road and the railway embankment and comprises a field that previously included the existing cemetery extension and allotments. The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release where the primary objectives are to protect the setting of the town and the separation from Telford, more than encroachment into the countryside. Accessibility to the A464 would provide an appropriate highway access subject to detailed assessment of further highway improvements at M54 14, Five Ways roundabout and Priorslee Road including the provision of additional footways. The site adjoins the complementary developments on the edge of the built form of the town which influences its landscape sensitivity to medium and despite its open aspect, forms part of a parcel with medium visual sensitivity. The site has little flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and a nominal surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site requires some Ecological Assessment and an Arboricultural Assessment. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has mature trees, hedgerows and tree lines especially around the cricket club and cemetery which should be retained where possible. The site lies in the setting of listed and non-designated heritage assets and require a Heritage Assessment including an archaeological assessment due to the scale of the site. Proximity to the A464 and railway indicate potential noise nuisance within any development, requiring a design solution. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance f |
|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. |
| Potential for Windfall? | No No |
| Potential for Allocation? | No |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this more isolated greenfield site in the Green Belt. It is recognised that the site makes a moderate-high contribution to the Green Belt and is situated in a relatively inaccessible location to the west of the town. There other sites with better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In future site P17a might serve to extend the settlement beyond its current built form and layout should it be possible to underpass the rail line at site SHF017 (north) to form a new highway link to the A464 (west) but this is not likely to happen for some time. This land is also not suited to employment development as the land lies in a relatively isolated location some distance from the current employment focus to the east of the town. |
| | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|--|--|
| | |

| Site Assessment - Stage 3 | |
|---|---|
| Site Reference: | P17b |
| Coal Authority Reference Area? | Yes |
| Mineral Safeguarding Area? | No |
| Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: | Yes |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: | 0% |
| Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: | 100% |
| Percentage of the site in the 30 year | 0% |
| surface flood risk zone: | |
| Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the EA | 0% |
| Historic Flood Map: | |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site identified on the | |
| national reservoir inundation mapping: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site benefitting from defence: | 0% |
| Percentage of the site within 20m of a | |
| detailed river network: | 0% |
| All or part of the site within a Source | Yes |
| Protection Zone: | res |
| Green Belt Considerations: (from the GB Assessment/Review) | The Green Belt Assessment undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel which performs strongly against purpose 2; moderately against purpose 3; and strongly against purpose 4. The Green Belt Review undertaken for Shropshire indicates that this site is located within a Green Belt parcel where the release for development would have a high level of harm on the Green Belt due to the weakening of the role of adjoining areas with regard to purpose 2 to separate adjoining towns and the level of encroachment on the setting of the town under purpose 4. No sub-parcels were identified which would have less harm. |
| Landscape Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Residential) (from the LVSS): | Medium |
| Landscape Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Visual Impact Considerations (Employment) (from the LVSS): | Medium-High |
| Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? | Υ |
| Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? | Shaw Lane |
| Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? | Y |
| Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? | Assumes the development funds improvements to Shaw Lane along the frontage, including widening, introduction of speed limit and footways. |
| Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? | N |
| Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? | Y. Subject the development securing improvements along Shaw Lane from the south east corner of the site to the A4169 junction, including speed limit and footways and a speed limit extension on the A4169 and an assessment of the impact on Innage Rd and Church St and associated junctions and delivery of any necessary improvements. |

| Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): | 16 | |
|---|---|--|
| Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: | None | |
| Ecology Comments Other Constraints: | There are ponds in close proximity to the western boundary. If GCNs are present in these ponds, a min. 50m buffer will be required. The southern boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. This should be enhanced. Requires Ecla and surveys for bats (trees, buildings and transects), GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. A PROW runs along the western boundary. | |
| Ecology Comments Management of Constraints: | Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. | |
| Ecology Comments Opportunities: | Potential to increase the amount of POS available in Shifnal. | |
| Heritage Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Heritage Comments Other Constraints: | Possible impact on setting of Grade II* listed Haughton Hall associated non-designated parkland (HER PRN 07526). Site includes possible deserted medieval settlement (HER PRN 03342) and large size suggests it may otherwise have archaeological potential. | |
| Heritage Comments Management of Constraints: | Heritage Assessment required with application (Impact on setting of LBs and non-designated parkland; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). | |
| Heritage Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Tree Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Tree Comments Other Constraints: | hedgerows and scattered trees around and within site. Belts of trees adjacent northern boundary and woodland with pools adjacent the west. | |
| Tree Comments Management of Constraints: | Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement | |
| Tree Comments Opportunities: | Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Seek to link to / expand belt of trees along railway embankment to north and woodland to the west. | |
| Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints: | | |
| Public Protection Comments Other Constraints: | Rail to the north. Agricultural to the northwest. | |
| Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints: | Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment although not much room to provide separation. | |
| Public Protection Comments Opportunities: | | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Residential): | Fair | |
| Consultation - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal (Employment): | Fair Page 173 | |

| Strategic Considerations: | This smaller, gently sloping greenfield site (part of SHF017 at 36ha) is situated to the west of Shifnal north of the A4169 (Bridgnorth Road) and adjoining the railway embankment. The land is located within the Green Belt with a high harm caused by its release. However, the release of SHF017 (excluding P17b) has a lower impact on the remaining Green Belt land. Accessibility to the B4169 would provide an appropriate highway access subject to the provision of a suitable junction possibly from the release of SHF017, extension of the restricted speed zone (30mph) and an assessment of the impacts on Innage Road and Church Street. The site adjoins the built form of the town with an open boundary in need of strengthening. The varying topography influences its landscape sensitivity to medium and despite its open aspect, forms part of a parcel with medium visual sensitivity. The site has no flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and no surface water flood risk. The site requires some Ecological Assessment and an Arboricultural Assessment. The presence of protected or priority species within or close to the site would require appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation and enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has significant woodland around the railway and cover should be retained where possible. The site lies close to the Shifnal Conservation area and may require a Heritage Assessment including an archaeological assessment of the history of the site. Proximity to the A4169 and railway indicate potential noise nuisance within any development, requiring a design solution. The site has a Fair sustainability rating due to the accessibility to many of Shifnal's facilities which mitigates for potential effects on the environmental values of the site. The site lies in a Source Protection Zone that encompasses Shifnal town but is some distance from the core zone located on Stanton Road to the north. | |
|---|---|--|
| Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Known Infrastructure Opportunities: | Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas. | |
| Potential for Windfall? | No | |
| Potential for Allocation? | No | |
| Recommendation | Protect land within the Green Belt | |
| | | |
| Reasoning | There are more preferable sites available within Shifnal which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this very isolated greenfield site in the Green Belt to the west of Shifnal. It is recognised that the site makes a moderate-high contribution to the Green Belt and is situated in a relatively inaccessible location on the A4169 Bridgnorth Road. There other sites with better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In future site P17b might serve to extend the settlement beyond its current built form and layout should the proposed development of site SHF017 (north) provide links to site P17b further to the west. This is not likely to happen for some time since site SHF017 (north) is only proposed to be released from the Green Belt as safeguarded land. This land is also not suited to employment development as the land lies in a relatively isolated location some distance from the current employment focus to the east of the town. | |
| Reasoning If proposed for Allocation, Potential | community than this very isolated greenfield site in the Green Belt to the west of Shifnal. It is recognised that the site makes a moderate-high contribution to the Green Belt and is situated in a relatively inaccessible location on the A4169 Bridgnorth Road. There other sites with better relationships to the built form of the settlement, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, have better access to the local highway network and may create more attractive gateways into the town. In future site P17b might serve to extend the settlement beyond its current built form and layout should the proposed development of site SHF017 (north) provide links to site P17b further to the west. This is not likely to happen for some time since site SHF017 (north) is only proposed to be released from the Green Belt as safeguarded land. This land is also not suited to employment development as the land lies in a relatively isolated location some distance from the current | |

| If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements: | |
|---|--|
| | |