

| Pinvin   |   |  |   |  |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address:   | CF50001 Land near to 1 Willincroft Cottage, Upton Snodsbury Road  | CF50165 Land at Manor Farm (Part 1)  | CF50166 Land at Manor Farm (Part 2)   | CF50208 Land to the South of Owletts End   | CF50306 Land to rear of Old Post Office, Allens Hill   | CF50395 Home Farm, Church Lane  | CF50540 Land off Main Street  | CF50605 Land West of Upton Snodsbury Road   | CF50699 SO947467 x- 394704 y - 246752   |
| Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?  | Category 2  | Category 2   | Category 2  | Category 2   | Category 2   | Category 2  | Category 2  | Category 2  | Category 2  |
| Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?   | Within 5 years, land owner supports development, no legal constraints   | Land owner supports. No indication of time frame or legal constraints  | Land owner supports. No indication of time frame or legal constraints   | No legal constraints, available immediately with support from land owner   | No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner  | 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  | No legal constraints, available within 5 years with support from land owner   | No legal constraints, available within 5 years, landowners supportive   | No legal constraints, available immediately, landowners supportive  |
| Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.  |   | No   |   | No   | No   | No  | No  | No but possible flooding problems from adjacent stream?   |   |
| Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?   | Yes   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  | Flood Zones 1 and 2 straddle the eastern boundary of the site from Piddle Brook   | Yes   | Yes   | Yes   |
| Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?   | Unknown   | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown  | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown   | Yes   | Unknown   |
| Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?  | Potential impact on sewerage network: medium<br>Potential impact on the surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Nearby watercourse | Potential impact on sewerage network: low<br>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Combined SW strategy with site CF50395 | Potential impact on sewerage network: low<br>Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: No SW sewer or nearby watercourse, but possible combined strategy with site CF50395   | Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: low<br>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.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available. | Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: low<br>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.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Adjacent Watercourse               | Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: low<br>Potential impact on sewerage network: High<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS. A combined drainage strategy with site CF50165 is recommended.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Adjacent Watercourse  | Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS. A combined drainage strategy with site CF50165 is recommended.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Combined SW strategy with CF50165 is recommended. | Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Nearby Watercourse   | Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Nearby Watercourse |
| Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?   | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge   | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge   | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge   | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  |
| Is the site in Green Belt?   | 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  | No  | No  | No  |
| Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?  | No  | No   | No  | No   | No   | No  | No  | No  | No  |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.  | Ribbon Development on Upton Snodsbury Road - these houses would need amenity safeguarded through sympathetic design. Open fields surrounded other parts of the site.  | A small part of the site is bounded by dwellings in Pinvin but it is mostly bounded by open agricultural fields. The site also completely surrounds a common site, the amenity of which would be greatly impacted if all of the site came forward.   | This site borders one property to the west but is otherwise surrounded by open fields   | The site is bound on the north by properties on Owletts Lane. It is also bound on the west and south by some properties. These properties would need amenity safeguarded by sympathetic design features incorporated into the scheme.  | Site is surrounded on two sides by residential dwellings. These properties would need amenity safeguarded by sympathetic design features incorporated into the scheme. To the west is a Livery.  | The site is predominantly surrounded by open fields, although part of the site is located near to a recycling centre. There are some dwellings located near the north western border of the site.   | Site would require the demolition of two properties and the site would then be backland development bordering neighbouring gardens.   | Site is surrounded on two sides by open fields and on one side by housing. The properties would need their amenity safeguarded through sympathetic design.  | Site is located on a former nursery site a small distance away from the main village of Pinvin, surrounded by large open fields   |
| Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  | Unknown   | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown  | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown   | Unknown   | Unknown   |
| Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?  |   | No   |   | No   | No   | No  | No  | No  |   |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?  |   | Romano/British-Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation needed.  |   | Romano/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed   | Romano/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed   | Romano/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed  | Romano/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed  | Romano/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed  | Romano/British-Medieval potential. Evaluation and possible mitigation needed  |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).  |   | No   |   | Yes - Orchard Lea next to proposed access  | No   | Yes - Orchard Lea   | No  | No  |   |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?   | 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?       |   | Just over 250m from brook LWS.   |   | No   | No   | Disproportionately large site for size of village, expanding into open countryside alongside Piddle Brook. Adverse cumulative visual impact in consideration of other developments existing and approved in locality. Adverse impact on enjoyment of rural public footpaths.  | Features scrub habitat - may qualify as priority habitat.   | No  |   |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.   |   | No   |   | No   | No   | No  | No  | No  |   |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?  |   | Yes - part of the site is located on a piece of land designated as a significant gap although it is being proposed to remove this part of the significant gap  |   | Unknown  | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown   | Unknown   |   |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?   | No  | No   | No  | No   | No   | No  | No  | No  | No  |
| Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?   |   | 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?  |   | No   |   | No   | No   | No  | No  | No  |   |
| Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?   |   | Yes - Grade 2  |   | No - Grade 3   | Yes - Grade 2  | Only part Grade 2   | Yes - Grade 2   | No - Grade 3  |   |
| Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?   |   | Noise assessment required. Some areas of the site may be unsuitable for residential development.<br>No History of PCL activities in regards to contaminated land<br>Consult WRS on Air Quality and Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings   |   | Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings<br>PCL on site - pond (inflated). PCL site adjacent - Old Gravel Pit. Risk assessment required and likely site investigation required  | Noise assessment required to determine the extent and impacts of noise at this location. Mitigation may be required.<br>Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings  | Noise assessment required to determine the extent and impacts of noise at this location. Mitigation may be required.<br>Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings   | Noise assessment required to determine the extent and impacts of noise at this location. Mitigation may be required.<br>Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings   | Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings<br>No History of PCL activities in regards to air quality   | Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings<br>No History of PCL activities in regards to air quality   |
| Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.   |   | Yes<br>Bus Stop - 100-200m<br>Train Station - 900-900m (Pershore)  |   | Yes - Bus 300-400m<br>Train - No (1.6km to Pershore)   | Yes - Bus 100-200m<br>Train - 400-500m (Pershore)  | Site is huge - part of site closest to bus stop is only 200-300m away but larger part of site extends far from nearest bus stop.<br>Closest part of site to Pershore station is approx. 1km from Pershore Station   | Yes<br>Bus Stop - 100-200m<br>Train Station - 900-900m (Pershore)   | Yes - Bus stop 0-100m<br>Train - approx. 1.6km to Pershore  |   |
| 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: 4-500m on road, 0-100m over fields<br>General Store: 1-200m<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 3-500m  |   | Primary School: 650m<br>General Store: 1km<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 700m   | Primary School: 700-800m<br>General Store: 100-200m<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 500-600m  | Primary School: 3-400m at closest point<br>General Store: 800-900m at closest point<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 500-600m at closest point  | Primary School: 4-500m on road, 0-100m over fields<br>General Store: 1-200m<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 3-500m   | Primary School: 5-600m at closest point<br>General Store: 1.1km at closest point<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 600-700m at closest point   |   |
| Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?   |   | yes  |   | yes  | no   | yes   | yes   | yes   |   |
| 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  | 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?   |   | Yes - the site would extend the village in an unnatural way into the open countryside. The entire village lay out would be drastically altered.  |   | The site would represent backland development and would have an impact on the character of this part of the village, particularly on the layout of the existing farm building and church. It would also have an impact on Listed Building Orchard Lea, located next to the proposed access.                    | This site lies on the very edge of Pinvin on the Pershore side of Abbey View Road. Whereas the context of Pinvin would not be altered as a result of the development, the site would represent backland development and as such would be an unnatural extension to the village.  | 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.   | Development on this parcel of land would represent backland development out of keeping with the surrounding urban form. The development would extend into open fields that would depart from the ribbon-esque development that is the predominant feature along Main Street.  | This piece of land is situated opposite and existing allocation which has been built out. Furthermore, the site does not extend too far into open fields and as such the entirety of the site would still be seen within the context of the village and is similar in size to the allocated site opposite. The site is also adjacent to existing residential development and would form a natural extension to the urban form of the village. As such, development of the site as suggested would not have a significant impact on the character of Pinvin. There have also been no major objections received from any major consultee. |   |
| Rule in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?  | Ruled out due to location/ isolation  | Ruled out due to scale and due to the fact that part of the site is located in a significant gap   | Ruled in  | Ruled out due to impact on historic environment  | Ruled in   | Ruled in  | Ruled in  | Ruled in  | Ruled out due to location/ isolation  |
| Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDRP?  | No  | No - see reasoning below   | No  | No - see reasoning below   | No - see reasoning below   | No - see reasoning below  | No - see reasoning below  | Yes   | No  |
| Summary  | Ruled out due to location/ isolation  | The site would extend the village in an unnatural way into the open countryside and is also extremely large. The entire village lay out would be drastically altered. The site would also encompass an existing site of which the residents amenity would be greatly impacted upon. Furthermore, the site is located partly in a significant gap, although it is proposed to have this removed as part of the review.  | This would have a massive impact on the character of the village as the size of the site is large and it is far beyond the Pinvin development boundary. Due to the scale and location, and consistent with the SHELAA Methodology, the site would usually be ruled out with respect to a SWDRP housing allocation for Pinvin. For some sites near Throckmorton Airfield it would be premature to rule them out until the provisional allocation boundaries for these strategic growth locations have been determined. For those sites that do eventually fall within the strategic allocation boundaries the proposed land use(s) will not be confirmed until the associated master planning work has been concluded. As such, whereas the site is not being allocated at this stage, it is not completely ruled out. | The site would represent backland development and would have an impact on the character of this part of the village, particularly on the layout of the existing farm building and church. It would also have an impact on Listed Building Orchard Lea, located next to the proposed access.                    | This site lies on the very edge of Pinvin on the Pershore side of Abbey View Road. Whereas the context of Pinvin would not be altered as a result of the development, the site would represent backland development and as such would be an unnatural extension to the village. Whereas the site is not preferred to be carried forward, it is not ruled out completely. | 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 Pinvin. Due to the scale, and consistent with the SHELAA Methodology, the site would usually be ruled out with respect to a SWDRP housing allocation for Pinvin. For some sites near Throckmorton Airfield it would be premature to rule them out until the provisional allocation boundaries for these strategic growth locations have been determined. For those sites that do eventually fall within the strategic allocation boundaries the proposed land use(s) will not be confirmed until the associated master planning work has been concluded. As such, whereas the site is not being allocated at this stage, it is not completely ruled out. | Development on this parcel of land would represent backland development out of keeping with the surrounding urban form. The development would extend into open fields that would depart from the ribbon-esque development that is the predominant feature along Main Street. As such, the site is not preferred for allocation.   | This piece of land is situated opposite and existing allocation which has been built out. Furthermore, the site does not extend too far into open fields and as such the entirety of the site would still be seen within the context of the village and is similar in size to the allocated site opposite. The site is also adjacent to existing residential development and would form a natural extension to the urban form of the village. As such, development of the site as suggested would not have a significant impact on the character of Pinvin. There have also been no major objections received from any major consultee. | Ruled out due to location/ isolation  |

| Pinvin   |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| SHELAA Site Reference and Address:   |  | CFS0706 Amajen House   | CFS0768 Upton Snodsbury Road  | CFS0815 Barns & Stables, rear 1 to 6 North End   | CFS0879 Main Road  |
| MAJOR CRITERIA   | Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?  | Category 2   | Category 2  | Category 2   | Category 2   |
|  | Have the landowner(s) clearly indicated that the site is available and can be developed within the plan period, (e.g. through SHELAA)?   | No legal constraints, available within 5 years, landowners supportive.     | No legal constraints, available within 5 years, landowners supportive.  | No legal constraints, available within 5 years, landowners supportive.   | No legal constraints, available within 5 years, landowners supportive.   |
|  | Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.  | No but possible flooding problems from adjacent stream?                    |   | No   | No   |
|  | Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?   | Yes  | Yes   | Yes  | Yes  |
|  | Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?   | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown  | Unknown  |
|  | Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?  |  |   | Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: Medium<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Nearby Watercourse | Potential impact of surface water sewerage infrastructure: Low<br>Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure: medium<br>Site will drain to Allens Hill SPS and Wyre Rd SPS. It is recommended that hydraulic modelling is completed to determine the impact on the foul network. If other developments in Pinvin are adopted it is expected that there will be capacity issues at both Allens Hill and Wyre Rd SPS. A combined drainage strategy with site CFS0165 is recommended.<br>Surface water should be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/ponds where available.<br>Outfall assumption: Combined SW strategy with CFS0165 is recommended. |
|  | Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?   | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge  | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge   | Unless infrastructure, air pollution, waste, combustion or water discharge   |
|  | 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   | No  | No   | No   |
| Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.                    | Surrounded by fields with some properties a short distance away to the north of the site   |  | Adjacent to a farm and also borders the back of residential gardens. Open fields surround the rest of the site  | Similar development on the north side off the main road. Site borders other residential development which would need amenity safeguarded along with open fields  |  |
| OTHER CRITERIA   | Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?  | Unknown  | Unknown   | Unknown  | Unknown  |
|  | Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?  |  |   | No   | Potentially result in small loss of protected open space   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or on archaeology?  |  |   | Romano/British-Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation needed.  | Romano/British-Medieval potential. DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation needed.  |
|  | 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   | 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?       |  |   | No   | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.   |  |   | No   | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?  |  |   | Unknown  | Unknown  |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?   | No   | No  | No   | No   |
|  | Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient hedgerow?   |  |   | 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   |
|  | Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?   |  |   | No - Grade 3   | Yes - Grade 2  |
|  | Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?   |  |   | Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings<br>Current use as Barn is a PCL activity. Risk assessment required   | Standard Mitigation Measures applicable to sites of >10 residential dwellings<br>No History of PCL activities in regards to air quality  |
|  | Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.   |  |   | Yes - Bus stop 0-100m<br>Train - approx. 1.5km to Pershore   | Bus - 300-400m<br>Train - 1.3km  |
|  | 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: 5-600m at closest point<br>General Store: 1.1km at closest point<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 600-700m at closest point  | Primary School 100-200m<br>General Store - 700-800m<br>Post Office: None in village<br>Doctors: None in village<br>Village Hall: 300-400m  |
|  | Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?   |  |   | yes  | yes  |
|  | 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? |  |  | Development on this parcel of land would represent backland development out of keeping with the surrounding urban form. The development would extend into open fields that would depart from the ribbon-esque development that is the predominant feature along Main Street | Development on this parcel of land would represent backland development out of keeping with the surrounding urban form. The development would extend into open fields that would depart from the ribbon-esque development that is the predominant feature along Main Street  |  |
| OUTCOME  | Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?   | Ruled out due to location/ isolation                                       | Ruled out due to location/ isolation and duplicate  | Ruled in   | Ruled in   |
|  | Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?  | No   | No  | No - see reasoning below   | No - see reasoning below   |
|  | Summary  | Ruled out due to location/ isolation                                       | Ruled out due to location/ isolation  | Development on this parcel of land would represent backland development out of keeping with the surrounding urban form. The development would extend into open fields that would depart from the ribbon-esque development that is the predominant feature along Main Street. The site is not preferred for allocation in Pinvin.   | Development on this parcel of land would represent backland development out of keeping with the surrounding urban form. The development would extend into open fields that would depart from the ribbon-esque development that is the predominant feature along Main Street. The site is not preferred for allocation in Pinvin.   |