

| Persnore   |  |  |                                     |  |  |   |  |                      |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|----------------------|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address:   |  |  |                                     |  |  |   |  |                      |
|  | CFS0101 Land off Wyre Road North   | CFS0304 2 Pensham Hill   | CFS0329 Sandilands Nursery, Pensham | CFS0350 Land at Orchard Farm   | CFS0350sc Land at Orchard Farm   | CFS0352 Land off Henderson Drive (smaller part of CFS0350)  | CFS0376 Lot 1, Pensham   |                      |
| MAJOR CRITERIA   | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?  | Yes  | No                                  | No   | Yes, This site overlaps Tiddesley Wood SSSI  | Yes   | Yes  | No                   |
|  | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?   | Yes  |                                     |  | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  |                      |
|  | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.  | 100% Flood Zone 1  |                                     | 87% Flood Zone 1, 13% flood zone 2 and 3   | 100% Flood Zone 1 (less than 1% flood zone 2)  | 100% Flood Zone 1 (less than 1% flood zone 2)   | 100% Flood Zone 1  |                      |
|  | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?   | Yes, but there is a gas governor adjacent to the western boundary.   |                                     |  | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  |                      |
|  | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?   | Yes  |                                     |  | No   | TBC   | Yes assuming the site abuts Dowling Drive  |                      |
|  | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?  | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  |                                     |  | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  |                      |
|  | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?   | No - unless airports helipads poultry farms etc.   |                                     |  | Yes, This site overlaps Tiddesley Wood SSSI (WWT). Yes - Site zoned from All Residential Development, Residential Developments of 10 or more to residential development of more than 100 houses.   | Yes, This site overlaps Tiddesley Wood SSSI (WWT). Yes - Site zoned from All Residential Development, Residential Developments of 10 or more to residential development of more than 100 houses.  | Yes - Residential Developments of 10 or more outside existing settlement; any residential over 100 - Cumulative impact Tiddesley Wood  |                      |
|  | Is the site in Green Belt?   | No   |                                     |  | No   | No  | No   |                      |
|  | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?   | No   |                                     |  | No   | No  | No   |                      |
|  | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?  | No Neighbourhood Plan  |                                     |  | No Neighbourhood Plan  | No Neighbourhood Plan   | No Neighbourhood Plan  |                      |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.                    | Residential to west but not immediately adjoining site, school to north and employment to east.  |  |                                     | Not for entire site - very large site - residential and cemetery to east, SSSI woodland to south-west.   | Residential and cemetery to east, SSSI woodland to south-west - would need an extensive landscape buffer to protect the SSSI, otherwise would not be compatible.   | Residential development on one side, remainder agricultural   |  |                      |
| OTHER CRITERIA   | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  |  |                                     |  |  |   |  |                      |
|  | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?  | No   |                                     |  | No   | No  | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?  | No   |                                     |  | No   | No  | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).  | No   |                                     |  | Yes - Impact on Woodmans Cottage (GII) and Cemetery (incl. Cemetery Chapel- Gil)   | Yes - Impact on Woodmans Cottage (GII) and Cemetery (incl. Cemetery Chapel- Gil)  | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?   | No   |                                     |  | No. Medieval agricultural activity which could mask previous occupation. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.   | No. Medieval agricultural activity which could mask previous occupation. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.  | 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?   | adjacent to priority habitat: woodland and pond; gcn and reptile records in the area. Landscape: No - subject to retention of roadside hedge   |                                     |  | Yes Comprises and lies immediately adjacent to LWS! This site overlaps traditional orchard. Landscape: large site partly on prominent elevated plateau land, in views from west bringing built form of Persnore over the brow of the hill into open countryside and in distant views from east/south east from Abbey Park, Pensham and Bredon Hill. Impact on enjoyment of use of public footpaths across site and loss of public views from those towards Bredon Hill | (Note: Comments on entire CFS0350) Yes comprises and lies immediately adjacent to LWS! This site overlaps traditional orchard. Landscape: large site partly on prominent elevated plateau land, in views from west bringing built form of Persnore over the brow of the hill into open countryside and in distant views from east/south east from Abbey Park, Pensham and Bredon Hill. Impact on enjoyment of use of public footpaths across site and loss of public views from those towards Bredon Hill               | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.   | No   |                                     |  | No   | No  | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?  | Within Sig Gap. Possibly, but local impact only as would fill current gap between residential and employment land, not strategic impact.   |                                     |  | No   | No  | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?   | No   |                                     |  | Yes, Tiddesley Wood SSSI (WWT). Yes - ancient woodland on site and along western boundary - direct and indirect impacts  | Yes, Tiddesley Wood SSSI (WWT). Yes - ancient woodland on site and along western boundary - direct and indirect impacts   | No   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?   | No   |                                     |  | Yes, possibly  | Yes, possibly   | No   |                      |
|  | Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?  | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event   |                                     |  | potential surface water flows within the southern end of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event  | potential surface water flows within the southern end of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event   | No - potential surface water flows from higher ground but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event  |                      |
|  | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?   | No   |                                     |  | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  |                      |
|  | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?   | Yes  |                                     |  | No History of Potential Contaminated Land activities, but consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings   | No History of Potential Contaminated Land activities, but consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of ≥10 residential dwellings  | No   |                      |
|  | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.   | No - 530m  |                                     |  | Yes - adjoins site   | No - 460m   | Yes - 380m   |                      |
|  | How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.   | primary school 800m; shop 1.3km; doctors surgery 1.3km; town hall 1.7km  |                                     |  | primary school 640m; shop 900m; doctors surgery 960m; community hall 870m  | primary school 1.2km; shop 1.6km; doctors surgery 1.4km; community hall 1.5km   | primary school 1.2km; shop 1.6km; doctors surgery 1.4km; town hall 1.5km   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?   | No - Will need footpath and segregated cycle route along the full length of the road as this route is used to access Keytec employment site, expected increase in HGVs if northern connection road is built.   |                                     |  | Yes Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development  | Yes Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development   | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development   |                      |
|  | Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.  | N/A  |                                     |  | N/A  | N/A   | N/A  |                      |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | The site was refused permission in 2014 and dismissed on appeal, but the character of the area has now changed with residential development to the west (albeit beyond a narrow open gap) and to the south on the opposite side of the road - both on allocations in the SWDP. |  |                                     | Yes - the northern half of the site is high above Persnore and development here would be prominent on the skyline and in long distance views of Persnore from all directions | The southern part of CFS0350 is lower than the northern part so is not so prominent on the skyline or in long distance views of Persnore.  | Yes - difficult to develop without harming character of settlement and would be quite obtrusive at the edge of Persnore   |  |                      |
| OUTCOME  | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?   | In   | Ruled out flood risk and location   | Ruled out - location   | Ruled out - scale  | In  | Ruled out - location   |                      |
|  | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?  | Yes  | No                                  | No   | No   | Yes   | No   |                      |
|  | Summary  | Adjacent to priority habitat: woodland and pond; gcn and reptile records in the area. Landscape: No - subject to retention of roadside hedge. Site is within Significant Gap but does not form a strategic function as small parcel of land sited adjacent to new residential development. | Ruled out flood risk and location   | Ruled out - location   | Potential harm to SSSI, LWS, orchard, landscape and listed building; too large. Land high above Persnore, prominent both from Persnore and longer distance views of Persnore. Noise assessment required and as a result some areas of the site may be unsuitable for residential development.  | The site lies immediately adjacent to the SSSI and LWS therefore a substantial landscape buffer would be required to minimise potential intrusion and harm to these protected areas - suggest this is shown on the map (10.924GI, approx. 41.2% GI, leaving approx. 15.346ha for housing). Although the southern part of the site is much lower than the northern part there are some higher areas which should be treated sensitively to minimise any potential harm to long distance views of Persnore. Similarly the | Concerns raised about cumulative impact on SSSI, but this is a relatively small site located away from the SSSI; includes some higher areas which should be treated sensitively to minimise any potential harm to long distance views of Persnore. | Ruled out - location |

| Persnore   |  |                           |   |                             |   |  |  |   |
|--|--|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address:   |  |                           |   |                             |   |  |  |   |
|  | CFS0417a Persnore College  | CFS0417b Persnore College | CFS0427 Former Nursery on, Defford Road | CFS0437 Manor Farm, Pensham | CFS0530 The Barn, Holloway  | CFS0556a Land forming part of Allesborough Farm, Worcester Road  | CFS0556b Land forming part of Allesborough Farm, Worcester Road  |   |
| MAJOR CRITERIA   | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?  | No                        | No                                      | No                          | No  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   |
|  | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?   |                           |   |                             |   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   |
|  | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.  |                           |   |                             |   | 100% Flood Zone 1  | 100% Flood Zone 1  | 100% Flood Zone 1   |
|  | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?   |                           |   |                             |   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   |
|  | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   |  |   |
|  | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?  |                           |   |                             |   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  | Medium impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply   |
|  | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?   |                           |   |                             |   | Yes - 10 or more outside existing settlements, or over 100 houses - Cumulative Tiddesley Wood                      | Yes - any residential development of 100 houses or more outside existing settlement. Protected species surveys   | Yes - any residential development of 100 houses or more outside existing settlement   |
|  | Is the site in Green Belt?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?  |                           |   |                             |   | No Neighbourhood Plan  | No Neighbourhood Plan  | No Neighbourhood Plan   |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.                    |  |                           |   |                             | Yes - Surrounded by agricultural land   | Yes - Woodland and agricultural land   | Yes - Residential, listed buildings and agricultural land  |   |
| OTHER CRITERIA   | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  |                           |   |                             |   |  |  |   |
|  | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?  |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?  |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).  |                           |   |                             |   | No   | Yes: Potential impact on Persnore Hall at n-e edge of site   | Yes: impact on Persnore Hall  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | Medieval agricultural activity which could mask previous occupation - DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.                | No. Medieval agricultural activity which could mask previous occupation - DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.     |
|  | 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?       |                           |   |                             |   | No   | adjacent to woodland. Landscape: Yes - prominent hilltop location  | Landscape: Yes - prominent hilltop location   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?  |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | no, provided corridors to and from the ancient woodland are maintained and enhanced  | No  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Has the site has been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?  |                           |   |                             |   | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event   | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event   | Yes - potential flood flow route from higher ground flowing south in to top end of the site   |
|  | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?   |                           |   |                             |   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   |
|  | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?   |                           |   |                             |   | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.   |                           |   |                             |   | Yes - 100m   | Yes - 210m   | Yes - 200m  |
|  | How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service. |                           |   |                             |   | primary school 990m; shop 1.3km; doctors surgery 1.3km; town hall 1.5km  | primary school 650m; shop 1km; doctors surgery 800m; town hall 1.1km   | primary school 650m; shop 790m; doctors surgery 400m; town hall 920m  |
|  | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?   |                           |   |                             |   | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development | Yes  | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development                              |
|  | Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.  |                           |   |                             |   | N/A  | N/A  | N/A   |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? |  |                           |   |                             | Yes - if developed on its own as is physically detached from existing residential development on the same side of the road. | Yes - prominent hilltop location, beyond belt of trees, visually unacceptable, access may be problematic           | Yes - sloping site, prominent location   |   |
| OUTCOME  | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?   | Ruled out - location      | Ruled out - location                    | Ruled out flood risk        | Ruled out flood risk  | In   | In   | In  |
|  | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?  | No                        | No                                      | No                          | No  | No   | No   | No  |
|  | Summary  | Ruled out - location      | Ruled out - location                    | Ruled out flood risk        | Ruled out flood risk  | Small site but is physically detached from existing residential development on the same side of the road.          | Large site in prominent hilltop location, beyond belt of trees, visually unacceptable, would extend Persnore over the ridge, access may be problematic | Site in prominent hilltop location, visually unacceptable, potential impact on listed buildings, surface water issue, access may be problematic |

| Persshore  |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address:   |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |  |
|  | CFS0641 Land at Persshore off Holloway   | CFS0661 Allesborough Farm, Allesborough Hill  | CFS0691 Land south of Wyre Road  | CFS0691sc Land south of Wyre Road  | CFS0806 Land at 42 Three Springs Road   | CFS0807 Land adjacent to Conningsby Drive   | CFS0808 Land adjacent to Abbeyvale, Holloway  |  |
| MAJOR CRITERIA   | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   |  |
|  | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?   | Yes   | Yes  |  | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   |  |
|  | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.  | 100% Flood Zone 1   | 100% Flood Zone 1  | Awaiting further comments from consultees  | Awaiting further comments from consultees   | 100% Flood Zone 1   | 100% Flood Zone 1   | 100% Flood Zone 1  |
|  | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?   | Yes   | Yes  |  |   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes  |
|  | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?   | Yes   |  |  |   | No  | Access cannot be provided without crossing adjoining land (CFS0641 and CFS0808).  | Access cannot be provided without crossing adjoining land (CFS0641)  |
|  | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?  | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  |  |   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply   | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  |
|  | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?   | Yes - any residential development of 50 houses or more outside existing settlement  | Yes - any residential development of 50 houses or more outside existing settlement   |  |   | Yes - any residential development of 50 houses or more outside existing settlement  | Yes - residential development of 10 or more houses outside existing settlement or residential development of 100 or more houses. A large part of the site is part of compensatory habitat for gcn license!  | Yes - any residential development of 50 houses or more outside existing settlement   |
|  | Is the site in Green Belt?   | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?   | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?  | No Neighbourhood Plan   | No Neighbourhood Plan  |  |   | No Neighbourhood Plan   | No Neighbourhood Plan   | No Neighbourhood Plan  |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.                    | Yes - residential and agricultural land to south   |   |  |  | Yes - residential   | Yes - residential and agricultural land   | Yes - residential, open space and agricultural land   |  |
| OTHER CRITERIA   | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  |   |  |  |   |   |   |  |
|  | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?  | No  |  |  |   | No  | No  |  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?  | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).  | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?   | No  | No   |  |   | No  | DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible further mitigation.   | 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?   | No  | Landscape: prominent site at entrance into town. Previous applications on part of site   |  |   | Landscape; No objection subject to retention of boundary vegetation   | less than 250m from LWS. Landscape: on rising land prominent in views from the east/south-east from Abbey Park and Bredon Hill  | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.   | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?  | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?   | No  | no but secure connecting corridors   |  |   | No  | less than 250m from ancient woodland  | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?   | 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?  | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event  | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event   |  |   | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event  | potential surface water flows from higher ground but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event  | No - no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event   |
|  | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?   | Yes   | Yes  |  |   | No  | Yes   | Yes  |
|  | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?   | No  | No   |  |   | No  | No  | No   |
|  | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.   | Yes - on site frontage  | Yes - 210m   |  |   | Yes - 100m  | Yes - 350m  | Yes - 130m   |
|  | How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service.   | primary school 580m; shop 1km; doctors surgery 940m; town hall 1km  | primary school 1.2km; shop 1km; doctors surgery 800m; town hall 1.1km  |  |   | primary school 630m; shop 1km; doctors surgery 800m; town hall 1.1km  | primary school 1km; shop 1.3km; doctors surgery 1.3km; town hall 1.2km  | primary school 680m; shop 1.3km; doctors surgery 1.1km; town hall 1.1km  |
|  | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?   | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development                              | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development   |  |   | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development  | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development  | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development                                     |
|  | Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.  | N/A   | N/A  |  |   | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | No - site is an area of sloping scrubland (former orchard) fronting The Holloway, it faces suburban housing development on the opposite north side of The Holloway and adjoins other low density suburban housing to the east. There is a single detached house on the adjoining land to the west, beyond which is open farmland. To the south the site adjoins open land with some trees. | Yes - but planning application for 27 dwellings allowed on appeal (17/00432) on part of site  |  |  | No - the site is surrounded by residential development - but long gardens to east, retain boundary vegetation; highway comments likely to be key. | The development of this site would be seen in context with the adjoining recent development but avoid higher land as on rising land prominent in views from the east/south-east from Abbey Park and Bredon Hill. Possible development in conjunction with adjoining sites to north - (CFS0641 and 808). Subject to access availability and suitability. | The development of this site would be seen in context with the adjoining development albeit beyond the vegetation buffer but retention of existing boundary vegetation would be welcome. Possible development in conjunction with adjoining sites to north - (CFS0641). Subject to access availability and suitability.   |  |
| OUTCOME  | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?   | In  | In   | In   | In  | In  | In  |  |
|  | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?  | Yes   | No   | No   | Yes   | No - safe access cannot be provided   | Yes   |  |
|  | Summary  | There are no objections from consultees. Development of this site would be viewed from Bredon Hill against the existing housing along Holloway. | Part of site has benefit of planning permission for 27 dwellings (allowed on appeal) but it is not considered appropriate to allocate the site because the appeal was determined in accordance with the specific application submitted and another layout or an increase in number of dwellings is unlikely to be acceptable in this sensitive location. | Initially mapped incorrectly, when redrawn touches DB and therefore requires assessment - consultee comments awaited. Site extends too close to Wyre Piddle, reducing gap to approx. 230m. | Smaller cut (western side of CFS0691) adjacent to Travis Perkins is considered acceptable for housing.  | Surrounded by residential development; retain boundary vegetation but no safe access can be provided for the extra development  | A large part of the site is part of compensatory habitat for great crested newt license and there is a preference to avoid development on higher land - these areas could form part of GI for south Persshore allocation, therefore may not achieve 75 dwellings calculated using the 30dph on the net developable area. Access across adjoining land (CFS0641 and CFS0808) | Suitable site for residential development subject to retention of existing boundary vegetation and suitable access across neighbouring land (CFS0641). |

| Persnore   |  |  |                                     |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address:   |  |  |                                     |
|  | CFS0818 The Willows, Station Road  | CFS1074 31 - 33 High Street  |                                     |
| MAJOR CRITERIA   | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?  | Yes  | Yes                                 |
|  | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?   | Yes  |                                     |
|  | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.  | 100% Flood Zone 1  | 89% Flood Zone 1 & 11% Flood Zone 2 |
|  | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?   | Yes  |                                     |
|  | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?   |  |                                     |
|  | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?  | Low impact on sewerage network. No comments on water supply  |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?   | No - unless infrastructure and water discharge   |                                     |
|  | Is the site in Green Belt?   | No   |                                     |
|  | Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?   | No   |                                     |
|  | Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?  | No Neighbourhood Plan  |                                     |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.                    | Yes - residential and unused land but all part of previous SWDP 47/1 allocation  |  |                                     |
| OTHER CRITERIA   | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  |  |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?  | No   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area?  | No   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).  | No   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?   | 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?       | Landscape: No objection  |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.   | No   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?  | No   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?   | No   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?   | No   |                                     |
|  | Has the site been subject to a surface water flooding event? If yes, is there a viable engineering solution to overcome it?  | Yes flooded in 2007  |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?   | No   |                                     |
|  | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?   | No   |                                     |
|  | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.   | Yes - within 100m  |                                     |
|  | How far is the site from the following key services - primary school, general store, post office, doctors surgery and parish/village hall? Please list the distance in travelling metres for each key service. | primary school 1.3km; shop 520m; doctors surgery 2km; town hall 1.1km  |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?   | No - Potential to increase car use if active travel routes are not inherent to and continuous with the development   |                                     |
|  | Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.  | N/A  |                                     |
| Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement? | No - surrounded by allocation SWDP47/1   |  |                                     |
| OUTCOME  | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?   | Ruled out - site has planning permission for 2 dwellings - doubtful it could realistically accommodate 3 more?   | Ruled out - too small               |
|  | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?  | No   | No                                  |
|  | Summary  | Planning consent (18/02702) granted for 2 new dwellings - doubtful that could site accommodate at least 5 dwellings, so ruled out. Also, issue of flooding which would require mitigation. | Ruled out - too small               |