

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF5029 Millbank Farm (Mushie Farm Park), Henk Bank, Henley Castle	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	CF5036's Henbury Trading Estate, Crown Lane, Henbury	
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	No	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	Yes - Green Belt, but as an extension to an existing and very successful site, this should be supported	
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	Yes for employment	
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	No	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Comment has not been provided	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where not additional gross internal floorpace is < 1000 square metres or any development leading to own water supply, plus other constraints	Comment has not been provided	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution, discharge of water or combustion	
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	Yes but immediately adjacent area designated as Major Development Site in the Green Belt	
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or objective? If yes, what?	Yes Henley Castle Neighbourhood Plan 'Make' January 2019	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Are the adjacent surrounding land uses compatible with employment use? Please state what they are.	Residential dwellings and open fields. Caravan site in near proximity	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	Yes - employment uses and railway	
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	Low - Site will drain to Moor Avenue SPS and Park Farm SPS which both have a history of pollution. Hydraulic modelling is recommended. Providing surface water is managed appropriately and does not drain to the foul network it is unlikely to cause significant issues.	Comment has not been provided	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	Low - Nearest sewer over 10m away, increasing developer costs if public sewer connection is required.	
Brownfield or Greenfield	BF	Brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	No	No - 250m	No - 150m	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Buildings (L)?	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs?	Comment has not been provided	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	TPOs across Henbury Trading Estate	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event in 5 years, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	Comment has not been provided from J&A	<1% < 30 years; <1% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30, 100 and 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 0% < 100 years; <1% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	0% < 30 years; 2% < 100 years; 3% < 1000 years	
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	Grade 3	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes - grade 2	Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact on potential development?	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Less than a third of the site is located in contaminated land	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Bus Stop - Yes (160m)	Bus stop no. Train station directly next to the site	Bus stop no. Train station directly next to the site	Bus stop no. Train station directly next to the site	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	Bus stop no. Train station no. However, Henbury train station is located on the NW side of Henbury Trading Estate	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	OUT - Market suitability	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SHMP?	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Summary	Site not suitable for development									Site not considered appropriate because it is on land of high agricultural land value (Grade 1). Also, proximity to oil pipeline.	Overall a good site. Site has some issues including conflicts with NCP (particularly Policy M20). Site is adjacent to ACNB and site is adjacent to site of regional or local wildlife importance (Langdale and Blackmore Woods). Site CF5036's preferred.	Site has some issues including conflicts with NCP (particularly Policy M20). Site is adjacent to ACNB and site is adjacent to site of regional or local wildlife importance (Langdale and Blackmore Woods). Site CF5036's preferred.	Site suitable for development	Take forward as a potential employment allocation - considered suitable by the Economic Development team. This site is a business number not of 019.				

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF58103 Kynock East Business Park, Parbhore	CF58112 Field to the North/East of Lower Turnidge Farm, Sockley	CF58113 Land to the South of Lower Turnidge Farm, Sockley	CF58114 Field to the West of Lower Turnidge Farm, Sockley	CF58117 Park Farm, Blackrocks Park Road, Malvern	CF58123 Land off Walkers Lane, Whittington	CF58142 Parcel A, Land adjacent Broadway Road, Woodchester, Evesham	CF58143 Parcel B, Land adjacent Broadway Road, Woodchester	CF58155 Apex Motocross, Conspury Wood, Parbhore Lane	CF58169 Land off Abbey View Road (B455), Wyre Piddle	CF58209 Land adj to the B4211, Newbridge Green	CF58323 Land at the Former Bullers Yard, High Peak Street, Cotswold	CF58325 Worcester West Broadway Worcester (Adjacent to SHELAA)
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	Yes		No	No	Yes	Yes	YES - Vile Park extension	Yes	No	Yes - Has a former permission for a filling station, and was refused for a supermarket. An excellent location for an appropriate use	No		Yes
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Open Countryside	Cat 1	Cat 1	No - Open Countryside	Malvern/Parley Swan (Open Countryside)	Town (Edge) Worcester (City/Town District)	Edge / Cat 4	Town	Strategic	Strategic Location	Open Countryside	Category 1	Town (Edge) Worcester (Malvern Hills District)
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	Yes	No	No	N/A	No	No	YES - Vile Park extension	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the time period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Yes for employment	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes Ownership - Single Availability immediate/within 5 years	Yes Ownership - Two Owners Availability immediate/within 5 years Housing or Employment uses being promoted	YES	Yes - available now	Yes - available in 5 years	Yes for employment	Yes	Available within 5 years	Proposed uses: housing, education and employment Ownership: Multiple Availability: 11-15 years
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	No info	No, but entrance to site potentially in Flood Zone 3.	No, but Flood Zone 3 only 25m from site entrance.	N/A	100% Flood Zone 1	Yes - 100% Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	All of site within FZ 1	100% flood zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	No	No	Mostly located in flood zone 1 Land adjacent to the banks of Leaden Brook in the north east of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Comment has not been provided	Unknown - to be confirmed	Unknown - to be confirmed	N/A	Yes	Access can be achieved but may require the signalisation of Whittington Roundabout to control vehicle movements.	Site is an extension of an existing which has safe access	Yes - county Highways. SPO accepted at Broadway Road, 600m from A46 - Highways England	Comment has not been provided from Highways	No	Comment has not been provided	Yes	No comments received
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated sites of ecological importance?	Comment has not been provided	Site adjacent to Leigh Brook SSS	Site adjacent to Leigh Brook SSS	N/A	Site is within a SSS Impact Risk Zone	Site is within a SSS Impact Risk Zone	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	No unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion.	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution, water, combustion or water discharge	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Yes - part of site of all applications over 100 houses and all over 50 existing existing settlements. Majority is lower impact
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No	N/A	No	No	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site in the ACNBS, or affect the setting of?	No	Yes - Site within Cotswolds & Malvern Hills ACNB	Yes - Site within Cotswolds & Malvern Hills ACNB	N/A	Yes	No	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	No	No	No	N/A	Yes - Herley Castle Neighbourhood Plan Made January 2019 The site is not allocated under Policy MCO 8 - Stings of Local Businesses	No	NO	Evesham Town Plan was adopted in 2016	No	No	No	No	Orderly and Downland Neighbourhood Area designated on 29th August 2017. Evesham NP was submitted for examination in June 2019 and the outcome is not recommended to go to referendum. Date yet to be set.
Are the adjacent surrounding land uses compatible with employment uses? Please state what they are.	Adjacent to Kynock East Business Park and railway line. However, it is located within the significant gap with a row of residential units to the west.	Agriculture	Equitation uses	N/A	Yes	Employment and/or Housing proposed	YES - site adjacent to existing employment, retail, car dealership and farming, also existing existing large scale employment land	Yes - adjacent to Vile Park	Yes - Site is already used for employment use	Yes - Located next to a roundabout with Wythson Depot and Orchard Nurseries located nearby.	Open fields - near to Public House	CF58322 to the north. A4233 to the east and residential to the south and west.	Adjacent to SHELAA Open countryside location in the significant gap.
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Comment has not been provided			N/A	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - Low The nearest sewer is a 225mm diameter sewer which is approx. 170m to the south of the site. To repair the site will require to the sewer. This drains to Blackrocks SPS. The site has had pollution issues.	No comments received	MEDIUM level impact. The development site drains to Evesham Sewerage system and Abbey RD. TPO. Hydraulic modelling is recommended.	Sewerage Network Impact - Medium	Low - There is known hydraulic flooding in the downstream network. The site will drain to Cotswold Sewer SPS. Flooded Road SPS. Groundwater Road SPS. Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine the impact. Proposed surface water is managed sustainably and does not drain into the flood network. Significant losses are not expected.	Low - Nearest sewer over 250m away. Site will drain to Wyre Rd SPS. Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the flood network. Proposed surface water does not drain into the flood network.	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trust	Low - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the flood network. Proposed surface water does not drain into the flood network.	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - High This is a large development, all of part of the site is likely to require parking, it will drain through the new development at Blackrocks in the existing local plan. A combined approach is likely to be required if the site goes ahead. There are known flooding and pollution issues in the downstream network and an enhanced sewerage growth scheme may be necessary to accommodate growth.
Brownfield or Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	N/A	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Oil pipeline approx. 550 metres away	YES	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Comment has not been provided			N/A	Site is adjacent to the ACNB	Yes - Site is located in the Significant Gap GI Environmental Character Area 'Protect and Restore'	TBC	Comment has not been provided	TBC by HCC	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Substantial loss of connectivity between pockets of high quality habitat Potential to enhance shared green infrastructure to be located in the design of the development, low density housing with a focus on connecting, buffering, emerging and restoring the isolated habitat pockets and incorporating meaningful SUDS GI Environmental Character Area: 'Protect and Restore' (Local) 'Protect and Enhance' (Local)
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No	No	N/A	Site is adjacent to the ACNB	Yes - Site is located in the Significant Gap	NO	No	No	No	No	No	Yes - in the significant gap.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?	Comment has not been provided	No	No	N/A	No	No	NO	Site not in conservation area. Archaeology - no comments received	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Buildings (L)?	Comment has not been provided	Yes - Listed Building (Lower Turnidge Farmhouse) adjacent to site.	Yes - Listed Building (Lower Turnidge Farmhouse) adjacent to site.	N/A	No	No	NO	No detrimental impact on Listed Buildings and not in Conservation Area	No	No	Yes, GI 18?	Yes	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No	No	No	N/A	No	No	NO	No	No	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE	Comment has not been provided	Potential impact on 3 Special Wildlife Sites - Broadbalk Meadow (100m from site), Lime Bank Pasture (150m) and Sockley Hill Wood (270m)	Potential impact on 2 Special Wildlife Sites - Lime Bank Pasture (50m from site) and Sockley Hill Wood (200m)	N/A	Site is 140m from site of regional or local wildlife importance and 150m from another site of regional or local wildlife importance	No	YES - would affectively extend Vile Park all the way between Blackrocks Road and Broadway Road. Road to Broadway is currently rural in character, with Vile Park being fairly well screened in views. Impact to maintain the character of the site is the route to 'Wythson's Jewel in the crown' and on Blackrocks Road private local roads. Also, public views towards Blackrocks, giving a sense of place, would be lost.	Comment has not been provided from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Yes - site comprises multiple LWS, ponds, wetlands and woodlands
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs?	Comment has not been provided	No	No	N/A	TPOs along Blackrocks Park Road.	Yes Potentially	NO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Comment has not been provided	No	Yes - TPO adjacent
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	Within Big Gap. Potentially, but local impact only as would reduce current gap between residential and employment land, not strategic impact.	No	No	N/A	No	Yes	NO	No	No	No	No	No	Yes - site is located in a Significant Gap
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	Comment has not been provided	N/A	No	N/A	No	No	NO	No	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Yes - loss of woodland, wood pasture and parkland and other priority habitats
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	Comment has not been provided	N/A	No	N/A	No	Yes Potentially	NO	No	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Yes - loss of extensive mature hedgerow network
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event in 5 years, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	Percentages have not been provided	North of site susceptible to surface water flooding	N/A	N/A	SIV Land Drainage Partnership Engineers - Risk 'low' Refer to LFA for OS requirements	No comments received	YES	Vary Low	Risk of flooding from surface water: 1%: 30 years; 2%: 100 years; 4%: 1000 years	0%> 30 years; 0%> 100 years; 1%> 1000 years	Comment has not been provided from BA	Comment has not been provided	No comments received
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No	No	No	N/A	No - Grade 3	No - Grade 3	YES - Grade 2	No	No	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Some parts of the site are grade 2, other parts are grade 3
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site. Close enough to impact on potential development?	No	No	No	N/A	Contaminated Land - PCL on site - infilled Ford Quarry, Park Farm. Risk Assessment and Body Site Investigation required. Air Quality - Class 4 (W) on air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings.	No comments received	No History of PCL activities	No History of PCL activities.	Yes - more than a third of the site is located in contaminated land	No	No	No	PCL on site - 2x unknown field ground. PCL site adjacent - 2x unknown field ground. Major Food Processing, sewage works, garage. Risk Assessment and Body Site Investigation required.
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	No	No	No	N/A	No bus stops within 400m No access to rail network within 400m.	Yes Bus stop approx. 40m away to southern end of the site Swan Inn, Sockley, St. SIV, X30 No access to rail network within 400m.	NO	No. Closest bus stop in 1075 metres away. Closest train station is Evesham which is 3200 metres away.	Yes - 400m	No	Bus Stop - No 643m	Bus stop 911m. Nearest train station is Droitwich Spa	Southern area of the site bus stop approx. 400-500m away (Droitwich) Yes Closest East House Sockley - 308 Northern area of the site - no bus stops within 400m Closest Sockley - Oaklands 300, 310 No access to rail network within 400m.
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	Yes - the site is located in the significant gap	NEOFAR - land currently agricultural, adjacent to car dealership and farming	No	Yes, prominent M50s site to east of motorway. Visually unobtrusive and would not reduce car dealership character. I acknowledge degradation of part of site due to motorist activity, but land could be returned back to agriculture.	Employment uses in this location could conflict with adjacent dwellings and residential amenity.	Yes		Yes
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	IN	Out - ACNB - Scale	Out - ACNB	OUT (Level 1)	IN (Level 2)	IN (Level 2)	IN	IN	Out - Market suitability / Access	OUT - Market suitability	OUT - Market suitability	IN	IN (Level 2)
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SHELAA?	YES	No - ACNB - Scale	No - ACNB	No	Yes	Yes (but site is not to be allocated)	YES	Yes	No	NO	NO	No	No
Summary		Site not considered appropriate because it is in the ACNB and is not. Also, potential impact on nature designations (SSSI and Special Wildlife Sites), potential impact on historic environment and potential surface water flooding.	Site not considered appropriate because it is in the ACNB. Also, potential impact on nature designations (SSSI and Special Wildlife Sites) and potential impact on historic environment.	Location	Site considered suitable for employment land use Grass site was approx. 14 hectares (gross) Not developable area approx. 6.3ha Overseas plan - consider at least 40% GI (SHELAA 4)	Located in the Significant Gap Valued Open Space Scale in relation to Whittington	Site is extension to nearby Vile Park an existing employment site	Site is considered suitable for an employment allocation as part of the expansion of Vile Park. Incorporates Highways comments and LWS	Unserviced site. Access into site is not suitable and topography make this highly unsuitable.	Site not suitable for development		The site is accessible from the highway and located within the built up area of the village. The site has a previous employment use and therefore any redevelopment for employment use would have to be of a type that would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The future use of the site should be considered in the emerging Cotswold Neighbourhood Plan.	Large scale development in the open countryside (significant gap). Site is not considered to be a strategic (potential) option for the SHELAA review.

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF5029 Worcester West Broadhead (Land adjacent to Temple Langhams Factory)	CF5029 Land at Sandfields, Kingsport, Marley	CF5029 Land to the east of Junction 5 of the M5, Wythold	CF5029 Land to the West of Stoke Road, Wythold	CF5029 Land west of M5, Junction 5, Wythold	CF5029 Land east of Abbey Road (A146), Evesham	CF5029 Land off Gaultrey (A146) and Worcester Road (B644), Evesham	CF5024 Land at Woodlands, Berrington Park, Tenbury Wells	CF5028 Land at Housell Road, Malvern	CF5034 Shrewsbury Rural Park, Talbot Hill, Worcester (Special use of Recreation & Birmingham Canal)	CF5035 Land west of the A4400 Whittington Rd / Inshelwood Way, Worcester	CF5035 Home Farm, Church Lane, Pewsey	CF5036 Land immediately adjoining southern side of A44, Wyre Piddle	CF5040 Eaton Farm, Church Lane, Tisburyton
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	Duplicate	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	NA	Cat 1	Abbots Cat 1 Village	Abbots Cat 1 Village	Open Countryside	Town	Town	Town	Town	Town	Town	Category 2	Strategic Location	Category 2
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	NA	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No - redevelopment of retail	No	No	No	Yes
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	NA	Yes	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Yes - available now	Available now	Yes	Yes	Ownership - Single Availability within 5 years	Yes Ownership - Single Availability within 5 years	The two parcels of land are currently subject to agricultural tenancy agreements. Parcel 1 available in 2021. Parcel 2 available within 24 months of go for Parcel 1. Landowners supportive of development.	Yes for employment and/or housing	Available within 5 years
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	NA	No	TBC	TBC	TBC	One third of site within Flood zones 2 and 3	No	100% Flood Zone 1	Yes - 100% Flood Zone 1	No	No	No info	100% Flood zone 1	
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	NA	Potential access issues - to be confirmed	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided	Highways comment not provided	No Highways comment provided	No Highways comment provided	Yes	No comments received	Unknown	Comment has not been provided	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where total net additional gross internal floorpace is > 1,000 square metres or more, And other constraints		
Would development of the site compromise International or Nationally designated sites of ecological importance?	NA	Input into SSS	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where total additional gross internal floorpace is > 1,000 square metres or any development leading to own water supply, plus other constraints	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where total additional gross internal floorpace is > 1,000 square metres or any development leading to own water supply, plus other constraints	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where total additional gross internal floorpace is > 1,000 square metres or any development leading to own water supply, plus other constraints	No comments provided	No - unless airports helps priority farms etc.	No - Landscape officer comments - impact zone SSS residential >100 units - CONELT Natural England	No	No	Unless infrastructure, or pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge	Comment has not been provided	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where total net additional gross internal floorpace following development is > 1,000 square metres or more, And other constraints	
Is the site in Green Belt?	NA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	NA	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	NA	Neighbourhood Plan - made January 2016. Site would conflict with Policy MND1 (Landscape Design Principles) - site conflicts with Key View 4.	TBC	TBC	TBC	Evesham Town Plan was adopted in 2016	No	Yes - Neighbourhood Plan - made in June 2016. Site conflicts with Policy M72 (Malvern Link Rail Station Opportunity Area).	No	No	No	No	No	
Are the adjacent surrounding land uses compatible with employment use? Please state what they are.	NA	Agriculture. Adjacent to residential development.	No	No	No	No	Possibly - residential, school and commercial uses surround the site.	Car parking and residential	Yes	Employment land use proposed Some other development to the south of the site, but mostly open location.	No	Located adjacent to the A44 and the railway line. Also located within close proximity to Purborne Trading Estate.	Yes - agriculture	
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	NA	There are no reported flooding or pollution incidents downstream. Due to the size of the development a comparison to the existing capacity is not required for the total capacity of the sewerage system. Possible additional site if surface water is unable to be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water reserves and distance to watercourse indicates the site has a risk of surface water is allowed to connect to the foot network.	TBC	TBC	TBC	No comment provided from Severn Trent.	Estimated water hydraulic capacity of 1000 dwellings. Significant headroom available in terms of capacity performance. There is some spare capacity in the WWT. However improvements would be required to allow capacity to be greater than 2000 dwellings. Medium. The site would drain to Worcester Rd SPS and CDO and Abbey Rd SPS. Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine the impact.	Severn Trent - There are known hydraulic flooding issues in the downstream network.	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - Medium There are known hydraulic flooding and pollution issues in the downstream network. Site will drain to Digby SPS and CDO. Detailed hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact. As this is a brownfield site there are opportunities for treatment through separating the crude surface water from the combined system, this would be expected.	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - Low Site would drain to Whittington SPS which serves a small area. Hydraulic modelling recommended to determine impact on the foot network. If other developments in Pewsey are adopted it is expected that the capacity issues at both Abbey Hill and Digby SPS. The site is a significant increase in population to the combined network.	Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: low Impact - Low Site will drain to Abbey Hill SPS and Digby SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foot network. If other developments in Pewsey are adopted it is expected that the capacity issues at both Abbey Hill and Digby SPS. The site is a significant increase in population to the combined network.	Comment has not been provided	Medium - The site is likely to require pumping. There is known hydraulic flooding in the downstream network. The site will drain to Church Lane SPS, Purborne Road SPS, Church Lane SPS. Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine the impact.	
Brownfield or Greenfield	NA	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Brownfield	Brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	NA	Yes	TBC	TBC	TBC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Oil pipeline approx. 250m away	No	Flood Zones 1 and 2 inside the eastern boundary of the site from Piddle Brook	Yes	
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	NA	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No	Yes - loss of SUDS 38 (SUDS 43) green space G Environmental Character Area "Green and Nature" Public views towards Malvern Hills - some of these would be lost. Visually unacceptable.	No	Yes - loss of SUDS 38 (SUDS 43) green space G Environmental Character Area "Green and Nature" Public views towards Malvern Hills - some of these would be lost. Visually unacceptable.	Unknown	Comment has not been provided	TBC by HCC
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	NA	No	No	No	No	Yes - whole of site is protected Green Space	No	Northern part of site designated Green Space	No	Yes - loss of SUDS 38 (SUDS 43) green space	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?	NA	No. Potential potential SDA, some targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.	TBC	TBC	TBC	Yes - site lies adjacent to Conservation Area and Scheduled Ancient Monument	Yes - potential detrimental impact on Conservation Area although site not within it - setting. Archaeology. Possible medieval remains - SDA, survey and targeted evaluation and possible mitigation.	Yes - Southern part of site within Conservation Area. Northern part of site adjacent to Conservation Area. Within Tintley CA and in setting of Lark CA. Setting of grade II listed church.	Current development remains access to canal. Potential to improve access and setting of Canal CA. Archaeology - investigation (evaluation) and mitigation through planning process.	No - Part of the City of Worcester designated Conservation Area character and with strategic views to the Malvern Hills at this green area to the City. A proposed link from the Canal bank underfoot to open countryside. Archaeological remains identified in a limited field evaluation during previous applications. Some further investigation and mitigation needed.	Roman/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed.	Comment has not been provided	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)	NA	Yes. Adj. Oil LB - setting 30m from Longstone Cottage	TBC	TBC	TBC	Listed Buildings are adjacent to the site but maybe too far away to have an impact.	No	Yes. Within Tintley CA and in setting of Lark CA. Setting of grade II listed church.	No	No	Yes - Orchard Lea	Comment has not been provided	Yes	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	NA	No	TBC	TBC	TBC	Yes	No	No	No	Yes - Any development of this site would need very careful consideration of the setting of scheduled monument.	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated landscape site? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE	NA	100m from Scar Cottage Local Geological Site. Very close to the National Wildlife designation. Ecological four comments - LA, SSS, SUDS Habitat - Traditional Orchard.	TBC	TBC	TBC	Comment has not been provided from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	No - subject to substantial landscape belt being provided to boundary and northern boundaries - on long low, potentially visible from road and Birmingham Avon Way. Northern boundary would be new off-road interface - close to River Avon LPS and complex some traditional orchard habitat.	100m from Site of Regional or Local Wildlife Importance. Ecological Officer comments - necessary buffering for LPS, SUDS to buffer - after developable area	Yes	No	Yes	Disproportionately large site for size of village, expanding into open countryside alongside Piddle Brook. Adverse cumulative impact in combination of other developments existing and approved locally. Adverse impact on enjoyment of rural public landscape.	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs?	NA	No	TBC	TBC	TBC	No	Possibly - TPO affects south west border of site.	No	No	Retention of trees to be considered	No	No	No	TPOs nearby
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	NA	No	TBC	TBC	TBC	No	No	No	No	No	Unknown	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	NA	No	TBC	TBC	TBC	No	No	No	No	Site is partly covered by the Woodland Priority Habitat Network (Priority Commensal)	No	Comment has not been provided	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	NA	No	TBC	TBC	TBC	No	No	Internal hedgerows	No	No	No	Comment has not been provided	No	
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event in 5 years, to a surface water flooding event to overcome it?	NA	South of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Severn Trent Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	TBC	TBC	TBC	No comments provided.	1% risk of 20 yr, 2% risk of 100 yr and 6% risk of 1000 yr surface water flooding. potential surface water flow across the No boundary and through the middle of the site but no debris to southern there has been a surface water flooding event.	Southern part of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Severn Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (2% 20yr, 6% 100yr)	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (2% 20yr, 6% 100yr)	No	Percentages have not been provided	Risk of flooding from surface water: 2% 20 years, 6% 100 years, 6% 1000 years	
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	NA	Yes. Approx. 80% of site Grade 2 on Agricultural Land Classification	TBC	TBC	TBC	Yes - grade 1 - approx. quarter of site (SWS)	Yes - grade 2	No	No - Urban	No - Grade 1	Only part Grade 2	Grade 3	No	
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact on potential development?	NA	Contaminated Land - off-site petrol station site. Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities on site. PCL site adjacent - garage. Risk assessment required. Air Quality Comments - Control (SWS) on or Close and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings.	No history of PCL activities on site. Within 200m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	No history of PCL activities on site. Within 200m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required.	PCL on site - Level III Site. Potentially significant PCL issues on site. Within 200m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required and study site investigation required.	No comments provided.	Air Quality - Control (SWS) on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings. Contamination - No History of PCL activities on site. PCL site adjacent - petrol station. Risk assessment required. Air Quality - Control (SWS) on or Close and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings.	Contaminated land records - railways. Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities on site. PCL site adjacent - petrol station. Risk assessment required. Air Quality - Control (SWS) on or Close and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings.	Air Quality - Within Lowermost-Flattest Hill ACMA Consultation Zone. Control (SWS) on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings.	No - no comments	Noise assessment required to determine the extent and impacts of noise at the location. Mitigation may be required.	No	No	
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	NA	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Yes. Closest bus stop is 80 metres away (0.05 miles). Closest train station is 1207 metres away (0.8 miles).	Yes. Closest bus stop is 80 metres away (0.05 miles). Closest train station is 1207 metres away (0.8 miles).	Bus stop approx. 250m away Lowermost (stop 1) Services: 33, 34, 36, 38, 150A, X38 Shrub Hill Railway Station approx. 300m away Purborne Station Railway Station approx. 400m away	Bus stop approx. 250m away Services: 33, 34, 36, 38, 150A, X38 Shrub Hill Railway Station approx. 300m away Purborne Station Railway Station approx. 400m away	Site is large - part of site closed to bus stop only 200-300m away but larger part of site extends far from nearest bus stop. Closest part of site to Purborne station is approx. 50m from Purborne Station	No	No		
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	NA	Site likely to materially affect character of the settlement.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	WWT comments: Yes, partial overlap with traditional orchards. This site overlaps with traditional orchard grounds. These should be removed from and replaced against any allocation. Contaminated Comments - Habitat, PCL, Landscapes, TPO, SUDS	Potential impact on Conservation Area.	No	Potential impact on delivery of city centre employment development	This would have a massive impact on the character of the village as the size of the site is larger than the existing urban core of the village. This site is located just beyond Pewsey. Due to the scale and context with the SHELAA methodology, this site would usually be ruled out with respect to a SUDS employment allocation. For some sites near Theobalds Orchard it would be premature to rule them out until the provisional allocation process. For these sites that do eventually fall within the strategic allocation framework the proposed best practice will not be confirmed until the associated master planning work has been completed. As such, whereas the site is not being allocated at this stage, it is not completely ruled out.	Yes - large site in open countryside. Unacceptable visual impact in combination of cumulative impact with Worcester 4 and loss of views towards Tisburyton church and associated hamlet on Malvern. Would not respect rural landscape character.		
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In (Level 2)	Out - High Agricultural Land value.	Out - Green Belt and Market Stability	Out - Green Belt and Market Stability	Out - Green Belt and Market Stability	Out - Flood Risk and Loss of Valued Open Space	Out - Marine Designation and Archaeology (and Market Stability)	Out - isolation, no market appeal	Out - Loss of valued open space. Impact on historic environment.	In (Level 2)	Ruled in	Out - Market suitability	In	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SUDS?	No	No - High Agricultural Land value.	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (but not for employment)	Yes (but site is not to be allocated)	No - see reasoning below	NO	Yes	
Summary	OUT (Duplicate to CF5029) Site in CA	Site not considered appropriate for employment use because it has high agricultural land value. Also, potential impact on historic environment, conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan (Open View), potential access issue (to be confirmed), potential impact on local Geological Site, potential accessibility to surface water flooding and PWSM runs west to east through site.	Ruled out - Green Belt. Not considered suitable site for employment	Ruled out - level 1 Green Belt. Not considered suitable site for employment	Ruled out - level 1 Green Belt. Not considered suitable site for employment	Level 1 site - approx. third of site in flood plain. Concerns a loss of PWSM, high level parking, adjacent to Conservation Area and impact on SUDS. Also concerns a Market Stability for Employment.	Ruled out - not a suitable site for allocation. Battlefield / heritage Conservation Area (Orchards - Fences) - high level and market suitability. Submitted for master use - consider for housing and employment.	Ruled out on isolation	Commercial uses promoted	Valued Open Space	Potential impact on delivery of city centre employment development	This would have a massive impact on the character of the village as the size of the site is larger than the existing urban core of the village. This site is located just beyond Pewsey. Due to the scale and context with the SHELAA methodology, this site would usually be ruled out with respect to a SUDS employment allocation. For some sites near Theobalds Orchard it would be premature to rule them out until the provisional allocation process. For these sites that do eventually fall within the strategic allocation framework the proposed best practice will not be confirmed until the associated master planning work has been completed. As such, whereas the site is not being allocated at this stage, it is not completely ruled out.	This site has been allocated as a preferred site in the SUDS.	

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CFS046 Land to the east of Church Close, Broadway	CFS047 Beachingham Business Park, Goodson Road, Malmesbury	CFS047a Parashore College, Parashore	CFS047b Parashore College, Parashore	CFS048 Worcester St - Land off Parashore Lane, Tibberton, Worcester	CFS048 Land accessed off Law Road, Church Leach	CFS048 Land accessed off Ash Leach Road, Church / Ash Leach	CFS048 Land off Broad Lane, Bishopstrop	CFS048 Land off Cromwell Road, Crowle	CFS048 Land off Old Turpin Road, Crowle	CFS048 The Yard, Main Street, Bishopstrop	CFS048 Great Buckrams Farm, Malmesbury (Land north of N16)	CFS048 Land at Kennel Lane / High Street, Broadway	
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	No		Parashore College. There is scope for an employment linked to the academic education, in particular with a focus on agri-tech	Parashore College. There is scope for an employment linked to the academic education, in particular with a focus on agri-tech	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Category 1	Town	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Category 2	Open Countryside	Cat 3	Category 2	Category 2	Cat 3	Town	Category 1	
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?	Available within 5 years	Yes	Yes for employment and/or housing	Yes for employment and/or housing	Available now	Available now	Available now	Yes for employment or housing	Yes	Yes	Yes for employment or housing	Yes	Available now	
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone	No	No	No info	No info	91% Flood zone 1, 9% Flood zone 2, 8% Flood zone 3a, 2% Flood zone 3b	No	No	100% Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 1	100% Flood Zone 1	No, but Flood Zones 2 and 3 run partly along north-east boundary of site	No	
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes		Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided from Highways	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Comment has not been provided	Access via private drive - suitability looks questionable (see Highways comments)		Yes	
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated sites of ecological importance?	No - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Yes - Large infrastructure such as warehousing / industry where total net additional gross internal floor space exceeding development of 1,000 square metres or more. And other comments	No	No	No	No, unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge	No, unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge	No	No	Yes - any residential development of 100 units or more	
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	Brookway Designated Neighbourhood Area (14th Feb 2016)	Yes, Neighbourhood Plan - made in June 2015. Site conflicts with Policies M02 (Neighbourhood Open Space - site is Worcester Road (Broadway) and M01 (Exceptional Key Views)	No	No	No Neighbourhood Plan in Tibberton	South Leaches Designated Neighbourhood Area (10th September 2017)	South Leaches Designated Neighbourhood Area (10th September 2017)	No	No Neighbourhood Plan for Crowle and Crowle Green	No Neighbourhood Plan for Crowle and Crowle Green	No	Neighbourhood Plan - made in June 2015. Site adjacent to designated Local Green Space - Worcester Road - Policy M02 and Neighbourhood Open Space (Policy M01) - Greenfield Road	Brookway Designated Neighbourhood Area (14th Feb 2016)	
Are the adjacent/rounding land uses compatible with employment use? Please state what they are.	Yes - adjacent to vets and other. Road to north	Woodland. Adjacent to retail park and business park	No - Residential units located adjacent to the north and south of the site with the nearest access being a single road or going through the entrance of Parashore College. However, access is located to the west of the site.	No - Residential units located to the north and south of the site with access being a single track road. However, sewage works is located south with Parashore College located adjacent to the northern boundary.	Yes - employment	No	No	Yes if B1 uses - community use and agricultural	Residential to the east but mostly open countryside to the north, west and south.	Some dispersed residential nearby.	Yes if B1 uses - residential and agricultural	Agriculture	Yes	
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Low. Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network.	Seven Trench - Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network.	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Medium - The site is likely to require pumping. There is known hydraulic flooding in the downstream network. The site will drain to Crowle Green SPS, Phase 2 SPS, Crowle Green SPS. Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine the impact.	Low. Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network.	Low. Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the foul network, provided that surface water does not drain into the foul network.	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply	Due to the size of the development compared with the existing network, it is recommended that detailed hydraulic modelling is undertaken to identify the requirements required. Possible additional risk if surface water is unable to be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network.	Development site will drain to Crowle Green SPS which currently serves a population of 45. This site assuming proposed development would serve the population served by the SPS and requirements will be required. It is recommended that detailed hydraulic modelling is required to identify the requirements required. Possible additional risk if surface water is unable to be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network.	Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply	Seven Trench - High Impact Potential on sewerage infrastructure. Connection to Seven Trench to east end of site approximately 250m of site length required. Section west of site approximately 150m of site length required. Detailed modelling recommended to establish if capacity improvement is required.	High - There are known hydraulic flooding issues and pollution in the downstream network. A number of SPS and CSOs with site storage deficits are likely to be required. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is undertaken to determine impact	
Brownfield or Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No, North-east corner of site 50m from SW Corner Gas Distribution pipeline	Yes	
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Comment has not been provided		Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC by WCC	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	Yes. Site is designated Green Space.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No. Site adjacent to designated Green Space.	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?	Romano/British Occupation. Medieval occupation. Also located within Broadway conservation area	Yes. Site abuts Malmesbury Lark CA and provides woodfired buffer between CA and retail park. Immediate setting of several grade II* and I LIs. Highly sensitive in terms of heritage	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No	Romano/British Occupation. Medieval occupation. Also located within a conservation area	Medieval potential. Also located within a conservation area	No - but Prehistoric, medieval potential mitigation - Evaluation, possible mitigation	No detrimental impact on any Conservation Area. Archaeology - Prehistoric-Medieval Settlement	No detrimental impact on any Conservation Area. Archaeology - Prehistoric-Medieval Settlement	No - but Prehistoric, medieval potential mitigation - Evaluation, possible mitigation	No. Medical agricultural activity. could mask significant previous activity or occupation. DDA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.	Romano/British Occupation. Medieval occupation. Also located within Broadway conservation area	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Buildings (Ls)	Yes	Adjacent to, or within the immediate setting of 3 Listed Buildings. Yes. Site abuts Malmesbury Lark CA and provides woodfired buffer between CA and retail park. Immediate setting of several grade II* and I LIs. Highly sensitive in terms of heritage	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Site from Old farmhouse (Grade II Listed Building and outbuilding). Site surrounds and adjacent to 3 grade II listed farmhouses with associated farm buildings. Due to scale of site, potential impact on wider setting of further LIs in vicinity.	Yes	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No	No	No	No	No	TBC	TBC	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site (Local Nature Reserve Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site)? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE	No	Landscape officer comments - This would mean the complete loss of a large area of open woodland and G. Ecological officer comments - cumulative affect.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes. This site overlaps a grassland inventory site.	No	No. water courses, ponds, natural hedgerows. Records of freshwater crayfish, pond herons. Ecological officer comments - Outlined needs to be addressed to confirm if a SHELAA application if so, this site should not be allocated	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs?	Yes - trees with amenity value would be compromised by development on the site.	Yes. Whole site covered by TPOs	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No, but TPOs adjacent to south-east and north-east boundaries	TPO nearby	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes. Whole site in Significant Gap. Site would significantly narrow gap between Malmesbury and Leigh Sten.	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No	TBC	TBC	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No	TBC	TBC	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	<1% 100yr or surface water flooding - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	Seven Trench - Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	Percentage has not been provided	Percentage has not been provided	Risk of flooding from surface water: 2% 30 years, 9% 100 years, 17% 1000 years	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	yes overland flow flows from SW to NE	3% risk of flooding from surface water every 1000 years	<1% risk of flooding every 30, 100 and 1000 years	No - potential surface water flows in western part of the site but in details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	Some parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Seven Trench - Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	<1% 30 yr, 6% 100 yr and 13% 1000 yr surface water flooding. Potential flow flow risks within the southern part of the site.	
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No	No	Grade 3	Grade 2	No	TBC	TBC	No	Grade 3	Grade 3	No	No	No - Grade 3	
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	Contamination: No History of PCL activities. Air Quality: No Mitigation Measures Required	Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. No Quality Comments. Special Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings	No	No	No, but conditional	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	No History, but caution contamination from any previous agricultural practices?	No History of Previously Contaminated Land activities on site. Previously Contaminated Land report adjacent to site (Dunsmuir SPS), therefore Risk Assessment required.	No History of Previously Contaminated Land activities.	No History, but caution contamination from any previous agricultural practices?	Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRE or Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings	Contamination: PCL history on site as a Flashing/Slaghouse for kerolite. Risk Assessment and Air Quality Investigation required. Air Quality, Council WRE or Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 210 residential dwellings	
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	TBC	No	Bus stop: Yes, train station No	Bus stop: Yes, train station No	No	TBC	TBC	Yes - 380m	Yes - 356 Bus Stop 200m	Yes - 356 Bus Stop 160m	Yes - 160m	No	Not located near a train station but the site is 160m away from a bus stop	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	Conservation comments: CA, AONB	Possibly. Impact on Conservation Area	Comment from Landscape - Worcester 6 - already allocated. SHELAA put forward now?	No	Yes	The site is to the rear of the village hall and rises relatively steeply, any development would therefore be potentially prominent.	Yes	Possibly, due to location	Possibly, due to location	Yes - site extends too far west	Significant incursion into Significant Gap and would narrow gap between Malmesbury and Leigh Sten	Conservation comments: CA, SSSI, TPO		
Is the site in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	Out - Site and AONB	Out - Loss of valued green space. Impact on historic environment	IN	IN	Out - Planning Permission / Built Out	Out - Historic Environment and Market Stability	Out - Isolated and Market Stability	OUT - Market stability	OUT - Market suitability	OUT - Market suitability	OUT - Market suitability	Out - Scale	In - Other (Car park and 1 ha employment)	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SHELAA?	No	No. Loss of valued green space. Impact on historic environment	YES	YES	No	No	No	NO	NO	NO	NO	No. Scale High impact potential on sewerage and water supplies.	Yes	
Summary	Rule out - Site (Too Small and AONB). Also concerns re Conservation Area and TPOs. Also market suitability for employment.	Site not considered appropriate because loss of valued open space (designated Green Space) and impact on historic environment. Also, conflict with adopted Neighbourhood Plan policies on Neighbourhood Open Space and Exceptional Key Views. Also, site covered by TPOs			Most of this site has planning permission and is partly built out for employment uses and the remaining site is an allocated site for employment in the SHELAA. Further planning applications will be required to secure access and setbacks for development comprising 81, 50 and 88 sites. (Planning Ref: 18/01080/OUT/18/01438/04)	Rule out - Impact on Conservation Area / Listed Building. Could be access issue in addition. Submitted for housing and employment. Also Market Stability	Rule out - Isolated and Market Stability. No considered's suitable site for residential or employment.	Site not suitable for development	Site not suitable for development	Site not suitable for development	Site not suitable for development	Site not suitable for development	Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high impact potential on sewerage and water supplies. Also, which site would cause a significant incursion in to Significant Gap between Malmesbury and Leigh Sten, proximity to gap closure and potential impact on historic environment.	Site could be suitable to provide a 200 space car park and 1 ha of employment. If access could be secured could be part of a redevelopment of the Kerolite on the Broadford element of the site. Need to address Heritage / Conservation concerns.

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF5647 Land at Bushell Farm, Earls Crosse	CF5651 Land at Haxton Leves	CF5652 Land at Haxton Leves	CF5653 Land at Chatham Road (between A46 and B676), Selchester	CF5654 Land at Haxton on the Green and Selchester, near Excham	CF5655 Land at Haxton on the Green and Selchester, near Excham	CF5656 Land at Northwick Road, Northwick, Worcester	CF5658 Below and abutting around Drakes Brougham Business Park, Worcester Road, Drakes Brougham	CF5659a Land North of Worcester Road, Bromsgrove	CF5657 Land at Blackpole Road, Worcester	CF5642a Land off the Offham Bypass, Evesham	CF5642b Land off the Offham Bypass, Evesham	CF5642c Land off the Offham Bypass, Evesham	CF5652 Land adjacent to Blackmore Park, Great Malvern	
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NO - This development is not considered viable. The A46 is already at capacity. It is part of the strategic Highway Network but is only a single carriageway road. There is no station and no connectivity with Evesham.	No	No	No	This would extend the existing employment site and as such conforms perfectly to existing policy	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Category 4	Cat 4	Cat 4	Cat 3	Abund Open Countryside	Abund Open Countryside	Town (SAGE) Worcester (Wycham District)	Category 1	Open Countryside	Town	Town	Town	Town	Open Countryside	Open Countryside
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	No	No	NO	NO	No	No	No	Yes	No	No - but in industrial area	No	No	No	No	Yes
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the time period, is it through SHELAA?	Yes	Yes	Yes	YES	Yes - available now	Yes - available now	Yes Ownership: Single Availability: immediate/within 5 years Housing or Employment being protected	Yes	Available within 5 years	Yes Ownership: Single Availability: immediate/within 5 years	Available now	Available now	Available now	Yes - available now	Yes
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.	No	No	No	Flood Zone 3b - 0%, Flood Zone 3a - 0%, Flood Zone 2 - 25%, Flood Zone 1 - 75%	The site is within Floodzones 2 and 3.	FZ 1	Flood Zone 1 - 80%, Flood Zone 2 - 12%, Flood Zone 3a - 3%, Flood Zone 3b - 0%	No	TBC	Flood Zone 1 60%, Flood Zone 2 32%, Flood Zone 3a 3%, Flood Zone 3b 3%	Less than a field within flood zone 2 and 3	No	TBC	No. Very small part of western boundary in Flood Zone 3	
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Highways comment provided	No Highways comment provided	No Highways comment provided	Yes	Yes	Highways comment not provided	No comments received	Yes	Comment from Highways has not been provided	No Highways comment provided	No Highways comment provided	Yes
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Yes - Any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas. All planning applications over 500 houses	Yes - Any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas. All planning applications over 500 houses	Yes - Any residential development of 50 or more houses outside existing settlements/urban areas. All planning applications over 500 houses	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	No comments provided	No comments provided	No	Large non residential developments and residential developments over 100 units - compounded with CF5657	TBC	No	No - unless airports helps poultry farms etc.	Comment has not been provided	No comments provided	No	No
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	NO	NO	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	No	No	NO	Evesham Town Plan was adopted in 2016	Evesham Town Plan was adopted in 2016	No	Drakes Brougham and Wallington with Haxton Neighbourhood Plan 'adopted' in 20th July 2017	TBC	No	No	No	No	Evesham Town Plan was adopted in 2016	Yes. Haxley Castle Parish Neighbourhood Plan adopted in January 2016. Site conflicts with Policy M10d (Siting of Local Businesses).	
Are the adjacent surrounding land uses compatible with employment use? Please state what they are.	Open agricultural fields and a farm/BSA surround the site	Open agricultural fields and a farm/BSA surround the site	Open agricultural fields and a farm/BSA surround the site	NO - no other employment land in village save for agricultural holdings. Site away from services for employees	No	No	Residential to the east/ south Flood zones to the west Isolated property/ open land to the north	Commercial buildings to the south of site including Drakes, Chase and some businesses	No	Employment land uses proposed Site is located near other employment generating uses.	No - Very few houses / hotel in vicinity - cut off from Offham Road area	No - isolated site	No	Industrial (Blackmore Park) and agriculture. Also, transfer site opposite proposed site.	
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	MEDM level impact. This site is a large increase in relation to the existing network. Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact. It will be likely to drain directly to the STW.	No comment provided from Severn Trent.	No comment provided from Severn Trent.	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - Low Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the local network, provided that surface water does not drain into the local network. Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure Impact - Low Adjacent watercourse Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	TBC	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - Medium There is known hydraulic flooding in the downstream network. The site will drain to Croxall Close SPS, Pound Brook SPS, Greenford Road SPS, Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine the impact. Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure Impact - Low Adjacent watercourse Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	High. There is known hydraulic flooding downstream. The development site drains to Evesham. Hydraulic modelling and Abbey RC TPS Hydraulic modelling is recommended. Site will help meet the need through the development at Offham Rd. It is possible the new SPS will have not sufficient capacity for the additional development.	Comment has not been provided	No comment provided from Severn Trent	A 200mm diameter sewer runs along the southern boundary and 300mm dia. through the site near the eastern boundary. These drain to Blackmore SPS. This site has had pollution issues.	
Brownfield or Greenfield	BT	BT	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	BT	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	No - 100m from an oil pipeline	No - 100m from an oil pipeline	Yes	Yes	TBC	TBC	Yes Gas Pipeline approx. 450m away	Yes	TBC	Yes Oil pipeline approx. 450 metres away	Yes	Yes	TBC	Yes	
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	GI Environmental Character Area Project and Entrance.	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	GI Environmental Character Area Project and Entrance.	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No	No	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes - loss of green belt land Yes - loss of SMDP 36 (SMDPR 43) green space	No	No	No	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?	No	POSSIBLY - Roman/medieval occupation-medieval potential. CBA, survey and targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Consider local habitats Conservation Area on Northwick Marsh SSS Bishops Pool pond (part of Northwick Manor Heritage Trail) Conservation Area is located in the south western corner of the site.	No	TBC	Adjacent to the canal GI, and also designated prehistoric GI, part of the northern green buffer zone/GI at the edge of the City Park.	Site not in Conservation Area. Archaeology - Significant Roman British occupation area - CBA, survey and targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	Site not in Conservation Area. Archaeology - Significant Roman British occupation area - CBA, survey and targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	TBC	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)	No	NO	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Consider impact on Common Hill House (Grade II listed)	No	TBC	No	No	No	TBC	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No	NO	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	No	No	TBC	No	No	No	TBC	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve/ Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated landscape site? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE	A visually intrusive site in open countryside not appropriate for development of this type	A visually intrusive site in open countryside not appropriate for development of this type	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Bishops Pool pond (part of Northwick Manor Heritage Trail) Conservation Area is located in the south western corner of the site.	Wetland in priority habitat Traditional Orchard and Semi improved ground to NE and on farm	TBC	Yes This site falls between a LWS and a grassland meadow site in an important green corridor along the edge of the city. Further work will be required in order to determine what buffering and protection will be needed for the site, prior to allocation. The outcome of this may affect the developable area.	Adjacent to River Avon LWS/compromise some habitat	Comment has not been provided from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	TBC	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	YES - Significant trees may partially compromise the development of the site.	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Consider trees with potential for TPO in vicinity	No	TBC	There are many trees of potential high value including potentially some veteran trees. No TPOs but a full survey would be required.	No	Comment has not been provided from the Landscape team	TBC	TPOs along Blackmore Park Road.	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	NO	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	No	No	TBC	No	No	No	TBC	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	No	NO	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Site is mostly covered by the Woodland Priority Habitat Network (Forestry Commission)	No	TBC	No	No	No	TBC	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	Maybe	NO	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Not known - seek to maintain ancient hedgerow if applicable	No	TBC	Yes, possibly	No	No	TBC	No	
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event in the last 5 years. Is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	Comment has not been provided from BIA	YES - huge breach through the middle of the site	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (0% 30% 2% 100% 11% 1000%) SW Land Drainage Partnership Engineers - No comments	Comment has not been provided from BIA	TBC	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (2% 30% 3% 100% 12% 1000%)	Surface water <1% 30% 1% 100% 3% 1000% no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	No comments received	No comments provided.	Some parts of the site appear to be susceptible to surface water flooding	
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	Grade 1	NO	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	No - Urban	Grade 2	TBC	No - Grade 3	Yes - grade 2	Yes - grade 2	TBC	No	
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to the site. Close enough to impact on potential development?	No	PCL on site - Sewage works. PCL site adjacent - former garage - Risk assessment and heavy site investigation required	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	Contaminated Land - No History of PCL activities on site. PCL site adjacent - Fish Ponds. Within 200m buffer. Risk assessment required	No	TBC	No - no comments Air Quality - insufficient information to provide informed comment	Air Quality - Consult WSES on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 110 residential dwellings Contaminated Land - No records held for location. Further investigative work relating to contaminated land may be required.	No comments received	No comments provided.	No comments provided.	
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Yes - Bus Stop 100m	YES - <100m	TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	Yes - bus stop approx. 200m away George Avenue Busstop 37	No - Bus Stop 40m	TBC	Yes Bus stop approx. 350m away Croxham Trading Estate Busstop 39, 623 No access to rail network within 400m.	No - Closest bus stop is 1931 metres away (1.2 miles). Closest train station is Evesham which is 3201 metres (2 miles).	No - Closest bus stop is 1931 metres away (1.2 miles). Closest train station is Evesham which is 3201 metres (2 miles).	No - Closest bus stop is 966 metres away (0.6 miles). Closest train station is Evesham which is 3201 metres (2 miles).	No - Closest bus stop is 966 metres away (0.6 miles). Closest train station is Evesham which is 3201 metres (2 miles).	
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	YES - site is adjacent to busy main road and an entrance to village away from built up area	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Risk of creating an isolated community - cut off by A46 by pass, railway and River Avon, noise and air pollution from A46. Road noise issues for NE of the site.	Risk of creating an isolated community - cut off by A46 by pass, railway and River Avon, noise and air pollution from A46. Road noise issues for NE of the site.	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Rule in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In	In	In	In	Out - Isolated and Market Stability	Out - Isolated and Market Stability	In (Level 2)	In	Out - Green Belt and Isolated.	In (Level 1)	Out - Isolated and Market Stability	Out - Isolated and Market Stability	Out - Isolated and Market Stability	In	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SMDPR?	Yes	Yes	Yes	NO - Others preferred	No	No	Yes (but site is not to be allocated)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes		
Summary	Site suitable for development	Site suitable for development	Site suitable for development	This development is not considered viable. The A46 is already at capacity. It is part of the strategic Highway Network but is only a single carriageway road. There is no station and no connectivity with Evesham.	Rule out - Isolated and market stability. Comprise several smaller scale of land. Would not meet the Development Strategy. Submitted for mixed use. Need to consider for housing and employment.	Rule out - Isolated and market stability. Comprise several smaller scale of land. Would not meet the Development Strategy. Submitted for mixed use. Need to consider for housing and employment.	Site is not considered suitable for employment land use. Please refer to CF5655 for residential site assessment.	This would extend the existing employment site and as such conforms perfectly to existing policy	Level 1 rule - rule out - Green Belt and Isolated. Submitted for both housing and employment. Also Market Stability for Employment.	Site is in the green belt and partially within Flood Zone 3. The site is located within a key strategic employment location for Worcester City. Site area is approx. 110ha Allowing for food production and 40% GI (SMDPR 4), approximately 7.5ha developable area.	Rule out - Location / Landscape / health concerns / high agri land grading - Access issues from Highways England and Market Stability. Site submitted for mixed use - consider for both housing and employment.	Rule out - Location / Landscape / health concerns / high agri land grading - Access issues from Highways England and Market Stability. Site submitted for mixed use - consider for both housing and employment.	Rule out - Location / Landscape / health concerns / high agri land grading - Access issues from Highways England and Market Stability. Site submitted for mixed use - consider for both housing and employment.	Site has some issues including conflicts with NCF (particular Policy M10d) and site is adjacent to site of regional or local wildlife importance - including the Blackmore Forest, and - opposite to Transfer site (potential compatibility with surrounding land), priority 1 in 6000 boundary, TPOs along Blackmore Park Road and PAVW run through site.	

Table with 14 columns: SHELLA Site Reference and Address, CFS868 Land South of Brookland Lane, Kempsay; CFS8678 Land at Brookland, Holdings Lane, Kempsay; CFS8671 Land at Brookland Lane, Kempsay; CFS8672 Land at Evasham Road (B4086), Cleave Prior; CFS8673 Land off Church Road and Mill Road, Hampton, Evasham; CFS8674 Land at Paveit Road, Hampton, Evasham; CFS8675 Land at Paveit Road, Hampton, Evasham; CFS8676 Land at Chatterham Road, Sedgborough; CFS8688 Land of Sawmill Walk / Blair Close, Evasham; CFS8689 Land to the north of Digney, Ryall; CFS8692 Site of currently permitted Worcester Six Business Park; CFS8693 Land at Worcester Woods, Worcester; CFS8699 No 72 High Street, Evasham. Rows include criteria such as Market Appeal, Location, Expansion, Flood Zones, Sewerage, and Heritage, with corresponding 'Yes', 'No', 'Yes - Available Now', and 'Comment' responses.

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF50742 Land at Drakes Broughton	CF50743 Land south of Hill Lane Nursery, Drakes Broughton	CF50742 Old Pump Farm, Poigisson	CF50741 Coverdale Farm, Harley Swan	CF50743 Ash Farm, Sandford Lane, Sedgborough	CF50747 Land to the north of Wood Farm Road incorporating Harrop Wood, Malmesbury	CF50747 Land of 11 The Laurels, Gloucester Road, Wilton	CF50743 Brookley Farmhouse, Box Wood Lane, Upton Snodsbury	CF50743 Bucks Street, Honeybourne	CF50625 Court Farm Cottage, Bredon's Hardick	CF50623 Brixton Pasture off Crown, Wyckbold	CF50624 Bear & Ragged Staff and Broughton Station and Coach Yard, Broughton	CF50624 Land north of Union Lane, Droobach Spa	CF50624 Land south of Union Lane, Droobach Spa (revised)
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	This site would appear to be a potentially marketable and deliverable rural site for employment	This site would appear to be a potentially marketable and deliverable rural site for employment	No	No	NO - Very poor access along a road that is single track in places	No comments received	YES - Potentially a suitable site for rural employment. Appears already to be some diversification on site.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Category 1	Category 1	Town	Category 1	Cat 3	Town	Category 1 Village (Wilton)	Cat 1	Category 1	Open Countryside	Open Countryside	Town	Town	Town
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	No	No	No	No	NO	NO	No	YES - Clarification required regarding existing employment site	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (in a through SHELAA)?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	YES	YES	Yes	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years	Available within 5 years
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone	No	No	No	100% Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	No	100% Flood Zone 1	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	No	Yes - Flood zone 2 and 3	TBC	No	No	No
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Yes	Yes	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Access currently in place for existing mixed use site	Comment not provided	Comment not provided	Comment not provided	Highways comment not provided	Comment from Highways has not been provided	Yes	Comment not provided
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated sites of ecological importance?	Any residential development of 100 units or more, or 50 outside existing settlements.	Any residential development of 100 units or more, or 50 outside existing settlements. Great Raytham Meadow SSS	Comment has not been provided	SSS	Coastal Landscape	Site within ACNB, 200m from SSS (Malmesbury). Impact one of SSS: Central NE for applications of >100 units residential	Impact one of SSS - All application would NE	No - unless infrastructure, no pollution, combustion or water discharges	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided
Is the site in Green Belt?	No	No	No	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Is the site in the ACNB, or affect the setting of?	No	No	No	Yes - Setting of ACNB Study - Land Cover Parcel MS9 Specificity Highfield Housing Category 'N'	NO	Yes, within the Cotswolds & Malmesbury ACNB	Yes - within the ACNB	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or objective? If yes, what?	Drakes Broughton and Woodbrough with Priory Neighbourhood Plan 'neat' (adopted on 28th July 2017)	Drakes Broughton and Woodbrough with Priory Neighbourhood Plan 'neat' (adopted on 28th July 2017)	No	Yes - Harley Castle Neighbourhood Plan 'neat' January 2019	NO	No - Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan in process of preparation	No	NO	Submitted a Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation ran from 15th March - 29th April 2020	Bredon, Bredon Motes and Bredon Motes (Bredon Park) Neighbourhood Plan was adopted on 28th July 2017	TBC	Ligh and Broughton Neighbourhood Designated Area (24th September 2015)	No	No
Are the adjacent surrounding land uses compatible with employment use? Please state what they are.	Public house to the north of the site with residential dwellings to south.	Disused (?) agricultural premises. Some residential dwellings on other side of road and adjacent to site	No	Open countryside and residential dwellings	NO - no other employment land in village save for agricultural holdings site currently serves for employees	Yes. Agriculture (sheep grazing)	Residential to the east of the site and common land to the south	YES - Site is removed from main built up areas of village and comprises existing mixed use site, adjacent to agricultural business	Open countryside to the north and east, railway line to the south and Bucks Street to the west	Surrounded by open countryside with residential dwellings to the north east and Bredon to the west	No	No	Railway line to the north, industrial units and Droobach Canal to the east, disused land to the south and Droobach Spa station to the west	Disused land to the north, industrial units to the east and south and Droobach Spa station to the west
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - High All flows will go to Cotswold East SPS, these are known hydraulic bottlenecks downstream of the development and the size of the development in relation to the existing system is likely to cause issues. Hydraulic modelling is recommended. Possible additional risk if surface water is unable to be managed on site through SUDS or watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicate this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network.	Seven Trent - Site drains to Malmesbury Park SPS, modelling is recommended to determine the impact downstream.	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact - Medium There are significant hydraulic bottlenecks in the downstream network. Hydraulic modelling is required to determine the full impact. Possible additional risk if surface water is unable to be managed on site through SUDS or watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water network and distance to watercourse indicate this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foul network.	MEDM local impact - Connection to Witley Rye SPS. Approx 100m off site sewer will be required. SPS may require improvement, known to have storage deficiencies.	Comment not provided	Comment not provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided	Low - Connection to 400m dia sewer near site boundary	Comment not provided	Comment not provided
Brownfield or Greenfield	GF	GF	GF	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	YES	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	TBC	Yes	No	No
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	GI Environmental Character Area 'Protect and Enhance'	TBC	GI Environmental Character Area 'Protect and Enhance'	TBC	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open spaces?	No	No	No	No	NO	No	Yes - ACNB	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Conservation Area - No (Desk Based Assessment, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation - Archaeology - Medieval agricultural activity, could mask significant prehistoric activity or occupation.	Yes, Abbot Malmesbury, CA. Setting of a number of LBs. CBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation. DSA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.	Conservation - No (Evaluation and possible mitigation) - Archaeology - Medieval potential	NO	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided from Heritage	Known medieval agricultural activity and some Roman/British occupation	No	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Some potential to impact the setting of grade II* Church of St Andrew	NO	Yes, Abbot Malmesbury, CA. Setting of a number of LBs. Site adjacent to Harrop Court	No	YES - Listed buildings adjacent to site but not within site	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided from Heritage	No	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No	No	Comment has not been provided	No	NO	No	No	NO	No	No	TBC	TBC	No	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site (Local Nature Reserve Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site)? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS WHERE	Yes - Duffy Copse. Landscape and extension of settlement beyond boundaries. May be scope for some small scale, low level, development subject to retention of boundary hedge to maintain rural character to rear/line. Would not necessarily conflict with identified designated settlement pattern	No open countryside, would impact adjacent rural character of farm. C conservation pressure and loss of connectivity for priority habitats.	Comment has not been provided	Boundary of TPO woodland	Boundary of TPO woodland	Landscape officer comments - Malmesbury ACNB. Ecological officer comments - Badger setts. Appropriate buffering and GI to protect SSS and LWS. Roman Remains. Consider connectivity/networks	watercourse along the boundary, appropriate buffering and GI - will 20% be enough?	LWS - River, Staff and Seven Brook. May be scope for some small scale off site on part of site. Keep open green heritage to A46 by retaining open area with new planting in filter units beyond	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	Adjacent to Droobach Canal LWS. Impact possible	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	No	No	Comment has not been provided	Boundary of TPO woodland	NO	TPO's on southern boundary of site	NO	No - Although, woodland located on site	No	TBC	Comment has not been provided from the Landscape team	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No	No	No	No	NO	No	NO	NO	NO	TBC	No	No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	Maple Duffy Copse A20W	Maple Duffy Copse A20W	Comment has not been provided	Boundary of TPO woodland	Yes - Honeydell Wood	No	NO	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	TBC	No	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	No	Maybe	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	NO	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC	TBC	Likely	Comment has not been provided	
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, to what a major engineering solution to overcome it?	Comment has not been provided from BA	Comment has not been provided from BA	Comment has not been provided from BA	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (1% 20yr, 1% 100yr, 1% 1000yr) SIV Land Drainage Partnership Engineer's Risk 'very low' to 'high' as Classified Refer to LFA for OS requirements	Seven Trent - Surface water should be managed on site through SUDS or watercourse/ponds where available. Parts of site (mainly in the centre) susceptible to surface water flooding	SIV Land Drainage Partnership Engineer's Risk 'low' to 'high' along boundary watercourse Lower Malmesbury Brook Refer to LFA for OS requirements	0%<30 years; 4%<100 years; 9%<1000 years	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided	0%<30 years; <1%<100 years; 3%<1000 years	Comment has not been provided	0%<30 years; <1%<100 years; 3%<1000 years	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	Grade 2	Grade 2	Grade 3	No - Grade 3	NO	No	No - Grade 3	NO	No	Half of the site is located in grade 1 agricultural land	TBC	No	No	No
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	No	No	No	No Quality - Contam 195 on PC Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 10 residential dwellings Contaminated Land - No History of PCL activities	Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Group 195 on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 10 residential dwellings. Contaminated land (other land) adjacent to north east of site and former Three Counties garage 25m to west of site	Contaminated Land - No History of PCL activities Air Quality - Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 10 residential dwellings.	Current use as Court Farm is a PCL activity. Risk assessment required	No - However, there is contaminated land adjacent to the southern boundary	Less than a third of the site is located within contaminated land	TBC	Comment has not been provided	Yes, Former chemical works.	Yes, Former chemical works.	Yes, Former chemical works.
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	No - Bus Stop 600m	No - Bus Stop 600m	Yes - Bus Stop 300m	No - Bus Stop 300m	NO	The Present Service, 363, 365 No access to rail network within 400m.	NO	Bus stop approx. 600m away (direct)	NO	Bus stop approx. 400m. Train station 200m	Bus stop approx. 160m. Train station is Ashchurch for Tewkesbury	TBC	Bus stop and train station is 161m away	Bus stop and train station is 161m away
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	Yes - on the river	Service. Plot Office 401 On the Riverbank Road	INDOFAR - land is part of an agricultural holding with this development nearby	Yes. Scale and location of site would materially affect the character of Malmesbury.	Yes - site would see development expanding into the south west of the area and is not in keeping with the current built form.	NO - site is an existing mixed use development	No. The site is separated from the main residential areas of the village via the railway line.	The site is in the open countryside with a number of dwellings in the vicinity. Bredon Park is a small residential settlement and any intensification of the site for employment use would have a detrimental impact on the settlement.	Yes	Yes	No. Site is brownfield and previously used for employment use.	No. Site is brownfield and previously used for employment use.	No. Site is brownfield and previously used for employment use.	No. Site is brownfield and previously used for employment use.
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	IN	IN	OUT - Market suitability	OUT - Market suitability	OUT - Location / isolated	OUT - ACNB. Scale. Historic environment.	(IN Land 2)	IN	IN	OUT - Open countryside, environmental impacts and loss of Grade 1 farmland.	OUT - Green Belt and isolated	OUT - isolated and Market Suitability for Employment	IN	IN
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SHREPP?	Yes	Yes	NO	NO	NO	No. ACNB. Scale. Historic environment.	No	YES	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
Summary	Site suitable for development	Site suitable for development	Site not suitable for development	OUT The site is in conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan. Also ACNB setting and scale of edge of village location.	Site is too far removed from main settlement and would worsen the capacity issues in the A46	Site not considered appropriate because it is within the ACNB, scale and location of site would materially affect the character of Malmesbury and impact on historic environment. Also, impact on ancient woodland and some parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding.	Adjacent to the southern extent of the development boundary but the site is poorly related to the village. Development potential would relate poorly to immediate surroundings. Within the ACNB and immediately neighbours Cotswoldian Corridor.	Site is an existing rural employment site and would benefit from treatment and intensification in order to create a more sustainable use of land	The site is greenfield and is close proximity to the railway station. Access onto the main road but County Highways have not indicated it as suitable. Site suitable for development.	The site is an existing mixed use site in the open countryside in close proximity to the River Avon. An agricultural proportion of the site is covered by Grade 1 agricultural land. Land is contaminated in part. Not suitable for further development.	Level 1 site - Public out - Green Belt and isolated (also market suitability for employment). Substantiated as a mixed use site	Would not meet the Development Strategy for housing and not considered a suitable employment site by Economic Development teams	There are no significant constraints preventing this site coming forward for an employment use. The site is proposed to be allocated for site use development in the Preferred Options.	There are no significant constraints preventing this site coming forward for an employment use. The site is proposed to be allocated for site use development in the Preferred Options.

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF5989 Land beside Bransham Court Wood, Tapping Road, Upper Stroudham	CF5982 Cedar House, Parkside Road, Eckington	CF5989 Land adj to South of Upton Stroudbury	CF5989 Land adj to South of Upton Stroudbury	CF5989 Land south of Vale Park, Evesham	CF5989 The Salway, Hanbury	CF5989 Land south of Navigation Lodge, Hanington	CF5989 Land Adjacent to Littleworth	CF5982 Land to the rear of Dachs, Ashton Road, Backford	CF5985 Two Shires Park, Weston Road, Henleybourne	CF5983 Land at Navigation Road, Digby, Worcester	CF5988 Land off the A446, Whittington	CF5983 Shury Lane, Long Marston
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No	Yes		NO - This site is not considered suitable for employment. Inappropriate location.	Yes	No	TBC		TBC		Yes	No comments received		
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Cat 4	Category 2		Cat 1	Town	Open Countryside	Yes - Cat 1	Cat 3	Yes - Cat 2	Open Countryside	Town	Town (Edge) Worcester (Wychavon District)	Open Countryside
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?		No	NO	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No - redevelopment of industrial estate	No	Yes
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the time period, (as through SHELAA)?	Yes	Available now	YES	Available within 5-9 years	Yes	Yes - Available now	Yes for employment or housing	Yes - Available now	Available within 5 years	Large areas are available immediately 0-5 years with the remaining up to 10 years before development is likely to be achievable. Most of the premises are occupied and have leases remaining. The well serves the scores for development in the short term over certain areas.	Yes Cherrybury Two comments Available immediately within 5 years Extension to net business, hotel, employment and a residential use proposed.		Available within 5-9 years
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.		No	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	No	No	100% Flood Zone 1, no risk of flooding from surface water in 100 years	No info	Over half the site within flood zone 2, small part of the site to the south in flood zone 3	No (less than a third affected by Flood zone 2 and 3)	90% of the site in Flood zone 2, Flood Zone 3a 10%, Flood Zone 3b 0%	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	No	No
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?		Comment not provided	Yes	Comment has not been provided	Access considered suitable WCC Highways	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Yes	Yes - Please note Navigation Road is not highway. It is in the ownership of the Canal and Rivers Trust.	No comments received	Comment not provided		
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated sites of ecological importance?		Comment has not been provided	YES - Any residential development of 100 or more houses (existing existing residential/industrial areas) equivalent in employment land would have an impact in the same manner	No - unless air pollution and combustion	Comment has not been provided	Biodiversity - No - unless infrastructure, minerals or air pollution, landscape, habitat.	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	Comment has not been provided	
Is the site in Green Belt?		No	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?		No	NO	No	No	No	No	Yes (majority of the site)	No	No	No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan (policy or allocation) if yes, what?		Eckington has submitted a Neighbourhood Plan. The consultation period 10th March - 29th March and the independent examiner's report was received in October 2019 with the recommendation the NP proceeds to referendum. The site forms part of a mixed use allocation in the NP.	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No	Submitted Neighbourhood Plan. Consultation ran from 10th March - 29th April 2019	No	No	Neighbourhood Plan was adopted on 10th September 2019
Are the adjacent/rounding land uses compatible with employment uses? Please state what they are.		Surrounded by open countryside with Cedar House to the west	NO - surrounding area offers little in ways of employment use, mainly for leisure use.	Yes	Open countryside	Yes - housing	No - Village of Littleworth and an allotment located NNE of the site along with Norton Village Hall and recreation ground to the west. However, there is a railway line that follows adjacent to the eastern boundary.	Yes - agriculture	Tower Farm House to the north, Henleybourne road to the east. Wychavon District boundary to the south and west.	Yes - would form a logical extension and/or redevelopment of the previous Digby development	The site is being proposed for employment/leisure uses. On the corner of the A446 Whittington Road roundabout. Some employment uses to the north.	Surrounded by open countryside with Long Marston Business Park to the east	
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?		Comment not provided	HGH - The site presents significant population increase to the existing network and the ETR is a site to require improvement works to support growth.	Medium. The development site drains to Evesham - Stratford upland and below RD TPE, hydraulic modelling is recommended.	Comment has not been provided from Severn Trent	HGH IMPACT - Site will drain by gravity to the works, site of development in relation to the existing network may cause issues. Hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact. A combined site strategy with CF5982 and CF5983 is recommended. LOW IMPACT - Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water return and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foot network.	Comment has not been provided	TBC	Potential Impact on the Sewerage Network - Impact - Medium There are known hydraulic flooding and pollution issues in the downstream network. Site will drain to Digby upland and CEO. Disabled hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourse/ponds where available. Lack of surface water return and distance to watercourse indicates this may be a risk if surface water is allowed to connect to the foot network.	Potential Impact on the Sewerage Network - Impact - Medium The site would drain to Powick STW. There are known hydraulic flooding issues downstream. Disabled hydraulic modelling is recommended. A combined drainage strategy with CF5982 is recommended. If site comes forward it may provide a strategic opportunity to upgrade Whittington Highway STW.	Potential impact of surface water drainage infrastructure - Impact - Low Naturally watercourse Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourse/ponds where available.	Comment not provided	
Brownfield or Greenfield		Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	OT	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield / Brownfield	Brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance		No	YES	Yes	No - 10m from a gas pipeline	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No Oil pipeline approx. 360 metres away from southern eastern of the site.	Yes Oil Pipeline approx. 750m away	No	
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?		Comment has not been provided	TBC	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	TBC by WCC	Comment has not been provided	TBC by WCC	Comment has not been provided	Comment has not been provided	GI Environmental Character Area Protect and Restore. Yes - site is a significant gap Loss of SHOP 38 (SHOFR 43) green space	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?		No	Adjacent to POS	No	No	No	No	No	No	Part of the southern portion of the site is SHOP 38 (SHOFR 43) green space and a LWS. Adjacent to Riverside Conservation Area.	Yes - significant gap Loss of SHOP 38 (SHOFR 43) green space	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?		Comment has not been provided	POSSIBLE - Prehistoric, Medieval potential. CBS, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.	No	Comment has not been provided	No impact on CA, Archaeology, CBS, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	Adjacent to Riverside CA and parts of the site are within significant views from High Bridge to the city centre/parade. Height restrictions will be required to accommodate this. Within the setting of 21 Grade II listed buildings in the vicinity. GI will be necessary including along the Riverside. Archaeology - Investigation (evaluation) and mitigation through planning process. Registered Battlefield.	Impact on significant gap Loss of SHOP 38 (SHOFR 43) green space	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)		Comment has not been provided	NO	No	Comment has not been provided	Yes - Impact on isolated setting of Navigation Lodge	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	Comment has not been provided
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?		No	NO	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No	No	No	No	No	No - SAM within the vicinity of the site	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE		Comment has not been provided	NO	No	Comment has not been provided	Landscape - No - In terms of settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character, this site in conjunction with part of CF5982 would extend the village such that it maintains a nucleated pattern. Subject to satisfactory boundary planting to open countryside.	Comment has not been provided	No	No	Yes Part of the site overlaps a LWS and should be retained. Careful protection of the remainder will be needed for buffering and treatment of the LWS. Riverside corridor is important for trees and lighting will be a significant issue.	No	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.		No	NO	Yes	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	No	No	Amenity trees should be retained in design and should be protected to TPO.	Consider trees with potential for TPO in vicinity	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?		No	NO	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?		Comment has not been provided	NO	No	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	TBC	No	No	Site is partly covered by the Woodland Priority Habitat Network (Forestry Commission)	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerows?		Comment has not been provided	NO	No	Comment has not been provided	No	Comment has not been provided	TBC	No	No	Not known - seek to maintain ancient hedgerow if applicable	Comment has not been provided	
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?		Comment has not been provided	POTENTIAL - surface water flood flows along the eastern and southern boundaries of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	No comments received	Comment has not been provided from BA	Yes - Major flood flow runs along southern boundary and from Higher ground. Regular occurrence during heavy periods of rainfall (Engineers, 2018)	Percentage has not been provided	TBC	25x30 years; 6% in 100 years; 20% in 100 years	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (1% 10yr, 1% 100yr, 0% 1000yr) SW Land Drainage Partnership Engineers - Risk very low FZJ R. Sewer; refer to EA (near flooding) & LFA for DS requirements	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? Yes (0% 10yr, 0% 100yr, 1% 1000yr) SW Land Drainage Partnership Engineers - No comments	Comment has not been provided	
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?		Grade 1	NO	No - Grade 3	Grade 3	No	Grade 3	No	No	No - Urban	No - Grade 3	No	
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact on potential development?		No	No - History of PCL activities	No comments received	No	Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of 0.1 hectare. No history of PCL activities	No	Less than a third of the site is located in contaminated land	Yes	Contaminated Land - No records held for location. Further investigative work relating to contaminated land may be required.	Contaminated Land - No history of PCL activities	Less than a third of the site is located within contaminated land	
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.		Bus stop 0.3m; nearest train station is in Parkside	NO	No. Closest bus stop is 365 metres away (0.8 miles). Closest train station is Evesham which is 400 metres away (0.5 miles).	No - Bus stop 44m	No - 650m	Bus Stop - Yes; Train station No	No - 700m	No	Digby Lane Bus stop 77 The Hill Garage Services 32, 52, 54, 332, 333 No access to rail network within 400m.	Yes - bus stop approx. 75m away Bus stop 323m		
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?		No	INDOOR - land is currently open agricultural field any development on a large scale would materially affect the area	No	No - In terms of settlement pattern as an indicator of landscape character, this site in conjunction with part of CF5982 would extend the village such that it maintains a nucleated pattern. Subject to satisfactory boundary planting to open countryside.	Yes	No - The site is an existing employment site in the open countryside.	No	Yes - site is covered by a significant gap.	No	No	No. Site is in the open countryside.	
Is the site in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?		In	OUT - Location	In	OUT - Market suitability	In	OUT - Market suitability	Out - scale	In	(N) Level 1)	(N) Level 2)	In	
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SHOFR?		Yes	No	NO - Others preferred	Yes	NO	NO	No	Yes	Yes (for mixed use)	No	No	
Summary	Site suitable for development	Not suitable for an employment allocation as it forms part of a mixed use allocation in the Eckington NP.	Inappropriate location for development	Site is considered suitable for an employment allocation as part of the expansion of Vale Park.	Site not suitable for development	The site has been put forward as a mixed use site for residential, office, shop, leisure, small workshop / unit facilities as well as repair for local needs. Potential site for development in conjunction with part of CF5982. Subject to satisfactory boundary planting to open countryside. However concern over surface water / flooding - would need adequate mitigation. The Neighbourhood Plan has allocated the preferred option site for Hanington and further sites are proposed at this stage.	The site has been put forward as a mixed use site. Development of the entire site would be inappropriate in relation to the scale of the village and is in an isolated location. The majority of the site is in the AONB, with ponds and pylons on site.	The site is an existing employment site and suitable for further development.	Site is suitable for mixed use redevelopment (combine with CF5983) See residential site assessment for further details regarding the employment land.	Validated Open Space In the significant gap.	There are no significant environmental constraints and the site is suitable for further development.		

SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CF5943b Shary Lane, Long Marston	CF5967 Springbrook Farm, Lower Isfordhills, Leigh Simon	CF5988 Guinness Park Farm, Leigh Simon	CF5991 Riverside Shopping Centre, Evesham	CF5919 Land to the west of Worcester Road, Open Barn Farm, Worcester	CF5924 Land at Gwiltone Farm (Northern Field) Berens, Worcester	CF5914 Land at Great Bullock's Farm, off Gt Linn, Malvern	CF5926 Land west of Wychohd	CF59161 Whiteley, 67A Main Street, Sedgeborough	CF5976 Land at Trow Way, Digby, Worcester	CF5929a Land at Mayfield Road, Malvern	CF5929b Land at Mayfield Road, Malvern
Market Appeal (Economic Development Team) Yes or No			No comments received	Yes	No comments received	No comments received		No		Yes		
Location - strategic, towns, Cat 1, 2, 3, 4 villages or open countryside (within or adjacent)	Open Countryside		No - Open Countryside	Town	Open Countryside	Town (Edge) Worcester (Styeborn District)	Town	Open Countryside		Town	Town	Town
Expansion of existing employment site - yes / no?	Yes		N/A	No	No	No	No	No		No - redevelopment of industrial estate	No	No
Have the landowners clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the time period, (as through SHELAA)?	Available within 5-9 years		N/A	Yes - Available New	Yes	Yes Ownership: Single Availability within 5 years	Yes	Available within 5 years		Yes Availability within 5 years Site is owned by City Council for access controlled by Canal and River Trust	Yes	Yes
Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone	No		N/A	95% Flood Zone 1, 1% Flood Zone 2, 1% Flood Zone 3a and 4% Flood Zone 3b, 1% of site in Flood Zone 2	Western boundary adjacent to Flood Zone 2	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	No, but Flood Zones 2 and 3 run partly along north-east boundary of site	TBC		100% of the site is in Flood Zone 2	No - South-east boundary of site Flood Zone 3	No
Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Comment not provided		N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes		Highways comment not provided		Yes	Yes with access via Hiber Green	Access onto A46/road not possible without accepting property and surrounding
Would development of the site compromise historically or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	Comment has not been provided		N/A	No - unless airports helpfully provide farms etc.	Site adjacent to North Hen and 160m from River Severn - both sites of regional or local wildlife importance.	No	No	TBC		No	No	No
Is the site in Green Belt?	No		N/A	No	No	No	No	Yes		No	No	No
Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	No		N/A	No	No	No	No	No		No	No	No
Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?	Pidworth Parish Neighbourhood Plan was adopted on 18th September 2020		N/A	Evesham Town Plan was adopted in 2016	Yes, Neighbourhood Plan - made in November 2017. Site conflicts with Policy K4 (Significant Gap). Site is adjacent to North Hen (Policy K12)	No	Neighbourhood Plan - made in June 2013. Site adjacent to designated Local Green Space (Lower Malvern Park - Policy M2) and Neighbourhood Plan - Policy M2) and Neighbourhood Plan - Policy M2) and Neighbourhood Plan - Policy M2)	TBC		No	Neighbourhood Plan - made January 2016. Site does not appear to conflict with Neighbourhood Plan	Neighbourhood Plan - made January 2016. Site does not appear to conflict with Neighbourhood Plan
Are the adjacent surrounding land uses compatible with employment use? Please state what they are.	Surrounded by open countryside with Long Marston Business Park to the east.		N/A	Yes - High street development - retail and mix of uses	Agriculture. Site adjacent to North Hen - site of regional or local wildlife importance.	Residential development to the south (SUDOP 454 Gwiltone Farm Urban Extension)	Agriculture	No		Yes - would form a logical extension of the previous Digby development (although this portion of the site is slightly more sensitive than CF5926)	Agriculture and Green Space / Commons Land	Agriculture and Green Space / Commons Land
Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	Comment not provided		N/A	Estimated open hydraulic capacity of 1003 dwellings. Significant headroom available in terms of quality performance. There is some open capacity at the 100% sewer representation would be required to allow capacity for greater than 2000 dwellings.	There are known hydraulic sewer flooding issues downstream. Hydraulic modelling recommended.	Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact: Medium There is no existing sewerage near to this development. The nearest sewer is over 400m away therefore developer could be able to lay higher capacity sewerage infrastructure. Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure impact: Medium There are no SIF sewers or watercourse nearby. Surface water should be managed on site through SUDOP or to watercourse/ponds where available.	Severn Trust - High Impact Potential on sewerage infrastructure. There are multiple hydraulic flooding and pollution issues in the area around the site. SUDOP 454 - it is possible this site could drain into the Park's catchment however it is likely that multiple improvements would be required. Early working would be required if this site comes forward to allow for alignment with existing sewerage infrastructure in the northern part of the Malvern catchment. Hydraulic modelling is recommended.	TBC		Potential impact on the Sewerage Network Impact: Low Development scale is unlikely to result in any significant impact to the local network. Provided that surface water does not drain into the local network. Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure impact: Low SIF sewer - Surface water should be managed on site through SUDOP or to watercourse/ponds where available.	A 400mm dia sewer runs through the centre of the site and will require protection or diversion. The sewer drains to Hill Green TPE and CSD. There are known pollution issues at this site.	A 400mm dia sewer runs through the western portion of the site and will require protection or diversion. The sewer drains to Hill Green TPE and CSD. There are known pollution issues at this site.
Brownfield or Greenfield	Greenfield		N/A	Brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield		Brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station? If not, what distance	No		N/A	Yes	No. Oil pipeline runs through the site from south to north	Gas pipeline runs through the site Oil Pipeline approx. 50m away	No. North-east corner of site 50m from SIF Covent Gas Distribution pipeline	TBC		No	Yes	Yes
Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	Comment has not been provided		N/A	Comment has not been provided	Site is adjacent to North Hen (Policy K12)	GI Environmental Character Area Protect and Enhance. The majority of the site is covered by SUDOP 38 (SUDOP 43) - green space		Comment has not been provided		Adjacent to LNR with very sensitive boundaries.		
Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	No		N/A	No	No	Loss of SUDOP 38 (SUDOP 43) green space	No. Site adjacent to designated Green Space.	No		No, but adjacent to Riverside Conservation Area. Adjacent to LNR with very sensitive boundaries.	No. North-western boundary of site adjacent to Green Space.	No. Parts of western and southern boundaries of site adjacent to Green Space.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or an archaeological?	Comment has not been provided		N/A	Site within Conservation Area. Archaeology. Medieval agricultural activity, could mask significant previous activity or occupation - Evaluation and possible mitigation.	No	Site is adjacent to Severn Conservation Area Loss of SUDOP 38 (SUDOP 43) green space	No. Medieval agricultural activity, could mask significant previous activity or occupation. DSA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.	TBC		Adjacent to Riverside CA. Urban and GI assets are similar to the Neighbourhood site through on a smaller scale. The site should not be developed in isolation of the bigger site. Adjacent to LNR with very sensitive boundaries. Archaeology - Investigation (evaluated) and mitigation through planning process.	Not affect Conservation Area	Not affect Conservation Area
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s)	Comment has not been provided		N/A	In case of Conservation Area with a large number of listed buildings adjoining the site, very sensitive in regard to both heritage	No	Consider impact on White Lodge (Grade II) and Bewick Knot (Grade II)		TBC		No	No	No. Listed Building (147 Market Road) 180m from site.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	No		N/A	No	No	No	No	TBC		No	No	Scheduled monument (routel site at Sherwoods Green) is 120m from the site.
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Special Wildlife Site / Local Nature Reserve / Regionally Important Geological Site or any other locally designated wildlife/landscape site? INCLUDE LANDSCAPE COMMENTS HERE	Comment has not been provided		N/A	A portion of the site located in the south west is identified as a SSSI of the remains of St Mary's Hilary	Site adjacent to North Hen and 160m from River Severn - both sites of regional or local wildlife importance.	No	No water courses, ponds, inland herbaceous. Records of freshwater invertebrates, pond herons. Ecological officer comments - Consider need to the decision to confirm if it is SUDOP quality. If so the site should be allocated.	TBC		Yes Regulated Battlefield Adjacent to Riverside CA	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs	No		N/A	No	No	No	No. but TPOs adjacent to south-east and north-east boundaries	TBC		No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	No		N/A	No	Yes. While site in Significant Gap	No	Yes. While site in Significant Gap. Site would significantly narrow gap between Malvern and Leigh Simon.	TBC		No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	Comment has not been provided		N/A	No	No	Wood pasture and Parkland SUDOP Priority Habitat (England) located to the west of the site		TBC		No	No	No
Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?	Comment has not been provided		N/A	No	No	Not known - seek to maintain ancient hedgerow if applicable		TBC		No	No	No
Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event in 5 years, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?	Comment has not been provided		N/A	2% 100yr surface water flooding, no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	South-east corner susceptible to surface water flooding	Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? No SIF Land Drainage Partnership Engineers - No comments	Some parts of site susceptible to surface water flooding. Severn Trust - Surface water should be managed on site through SUDOP or to watercourse/ponds where available.	TBC		Is the site at risk of surface water flooding? No SIF Land Drainage Partnership Engineers - Risk very low / F233 R. Severn, refer to EA Linear Flooding & LFA for DS requirements	Some parts of the site appear to be susceptible to surface water flooding	Some parts of the site appear to be susceptible to surface water flooding
Would development of the site result in a loss of best or more versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	No		N/A	No	South half of site Grade 1 and northern half of site Grade 2 on Agricultural Land Classification	Southern part of the site Grade 2 Northern part Grade 3	No	TBC		No - Urban	No	No
Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact on potential development?	Yes		N/A	No History of PCL activities	No. Contaminated land (was table to flood) adjacent to western boundary of site	Air Quality - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to site of C10 residential dwelling. Contaminated Land - Yes, PCL on site - Agricultural Land, PCL site adjacent - Agricultural Land. Risk Assessment and likely site investigation required.	Contaminated Land Comments - No History of PCL activities. Air Quality Comments - Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to site of C10 residential dwelling.	TBC		Contaminated Land - No records held for location. Further investigative work relating to contaminated land may be required.	No	No
Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	Bus stop 323m		N/A	No. Closest bus stop is 483 metres away (3.3 miles). Closest train station is Evesham which is 965 metres away (6.0 miles).		Yes - bus stop approx. 50m away Buses Line Service 333		TBC		Yes - bus stop approx. 260m away (most direct route) Digby Lane Station - 77 The 88 bus stop Services: 32, 52, 53, 54, 332, 333 No access to rail network within 400m.		
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the locality?	No. Site is in the open countryside.		N/A	No	Yes. Development of the site would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester.	Site is adjacent to SUDOP 454 Gwiltone Farm Urban Extension	Significant incursion into Significant Gap and would narrow gap between Malvern and Leigh Simon	Yes		No		
Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	In	OUT - Significant Gap	In (Level 2)	In - Mixed Use	In	In (Level 2)	Out - Scale	Out - Green Belt and Inclusion	OUT - Residential submission	In (Level 1)	In	In
Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SUDOP?	No	NO	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (but not for employment)	No. Scale High impact potential on sewerage and water supplies.	No	NO	Yes (for mixed use)	Yes	Yes
Summary	There are no significant environmental constraints and the site is suitable for further development.	Site is wholly within the Significant Gap and has therefore been removed from the process	OUT location	Consider site is suitable for a mixed use development to assist in supporting the existing centres that is currently suffering. Some concerns about loss of rural impact on heritage. Site area is 1.462 ha. If assumed 50% net open space, 30% potential dependent on density.	The site has some potential issues. The site is of high agricultural land value. Also, site within the Significant Gap and would reduce the gap that separates Kempsey from Worcester. Some concerns about loss of rural impact on heritage. Site area is 1.462 ha. If assumed 50% net open space, 30% potential dependent on density.	Site has potential for residential use but is not considered suitable for employment use. Please refer to residential site assessment when site is used as a general safeguarding area.	Site not considered appropriate because of scale and high impact potential on sewerage and water supplies. Also, while site would cause a significant incursion into Significant Gap between Malvern and Leigh Simon, proximity to open green and potential impact on historic environment.	Ruled out - Green Belt and Inclusion (due to material suitability for employment). Submitted as a mixed use site	Site has been submitted as residential use and subsequently removed from the process following site assessment	See CF5923	Site has no major constraints, subject to adequate water and sewerage supplies being available. PHW runs through the site.	Site has no major constraints, subject to adequate water and sewerage supplies being available. PHW runs through the site.