

Sedgeberrow									
SHELAA Site Reference and Address:	CFS0010 95 Main Street, 99 Main Street, Springfield Nurseries, Main Street	CFS0046 Land off Sandfield Lane	CFS0047 Land adj. to Oakwood, Sandfield Lane	CFS0066 Plot B, Land off Winchcombe Road	CFS0067 Plot A, Land off Winchcombe Road	CFS0118 Land at Lower Portway Farm	CFS0149 Land off Winchcombe Road	CFS0531a Land off Cheltenham Road (between A46 and B4078)	
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	
	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.	Flood Zone 1 - 100%			Flood Zone 1 - 100%	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	Flood Zone 1 - 100%	Flood Zone 3b - 6%; Flood Zone 3a - 6%; Flood Zone 2 - 25%; Flood Zone 1 - 75%
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?	Access achievable but Sedgeberrow isn't that sustainable a location (it has a school but not much else) and with the A46 so close it may be that any development will be car orientated.			Access achievable but Sedgeberrow isn't that sustainable a location (it has a school but not much else) and with the A46 so close it may be that any development will be car orientated.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?	LOW level impact - 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 level impact - 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. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/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 level impact - 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 level impact - 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. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/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 level impact - 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. Possible additional risks if a surface water is unable to be managed on site through SuDS or to watercourses/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.	MEDIUM 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.
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion			NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion	NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion
	Is the site in Green Belt?	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?	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
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.	YES - development adjacent; school nearby			NO - slightly removed main area of development	NO - slightly removed main area of development	POSSIBLE - site backs on to existing residential development but is slightly isolated	YES - adjacent to residential development	NO - site is isolated from main village	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?	TBC			TBC	TBC	TBC	TBC	
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or archaeology?	POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; Evaluation, possible mitigation			POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; DBA survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; DBA survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; DBA survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation	POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; Evaluation, possible mitigation	POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; DBA survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).	NO			NO	NO	NO	YES - Site forms the immediate setting of the church and is therefore sensitive to development.	NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?	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?	NO			NO	YES	NO	NO	YES - overlaps with River Isbourne LWS; Sedgeberrow is within the Landscape Type Principal Village Farmlands which has an identified settlement pattern of 'Nucleated pattern of expanded rural villages'. Development on this site would be at odds with that, extending the village away from its nucleated heart and proposing development in a linear manner between the A46 and Cheltenham Road. This would appear as an unnatural extension to the village.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on TPOs.	NO			NO	NO	NO	YES	YES - Significant trees may partially compromise the development of this site.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Significant Gap?	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?	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?	Potential surface water flooding in SE boundary but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event			NO	Potential surface water ponding in NW corner of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	Potential surface water ponding in western corner of the site but no details to confirm there has been a surface water flooding event	NO	YES - huge swathe through the middle of the site
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?	NO			PART - Grade 2	NO	PART - Grade 2	NO	NO
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?	No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required			No History of PCL activities	No History of PCL activities	No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required	No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required	PCL on site - Sewage works. PCL site adjacent - former garage. Risk assessment and likely site investigation required
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.	YES - 80m			NO	NO	NO	YES - 250m	YES - <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 - 350m, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A			PRIMARY SCHOOL - 1.4km, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A	PRIMARY SCHOOL - 1.7km, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A	PRIMARY SCHOOL - 1.3km, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A	PRIMARY SCHOOL - 1.1km, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A	PRIMARY SCHOOL - 1.5km, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A
	Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
	Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?	POSSIBLE - Insofar that the existing use is agricultural and that development of housing would see a change			POSSIBLE - Insofar that the existing use is agricultural and that development of housing would see a change; Sedgeberrow is within the Landscape Type Principal Village Farmlands which has an identified settlement pattern of 'Nucleated pattern of expanded rural villages'. Development on this site would not be at odds with that.	YES - Sedgeberrow is within the Landscape Type Principal Village Farmlands which has an identified settlement pattern of 'Nucleated pattern of expanded rural villages'. Development on this site would be at odds with that identified pattern, extending the village away from its nucleated heart.	POSSIBLY - Development would require elongated access to site	POSSIBLY - has the potential to effect the setting of a listed building	YES - site is adjacent to busy main road and on entrance to village away from built up area	
OUTCOME	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	IN	OUT - Location / Isolated	OUT - Location / Isolated	IN	IN	IN	IN	
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	NO - Other sites preferred	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO / POSSIBLY	NO	
	Summary	Site possibly suitable for development - at edge of existing ribbon development with further development to the east; access could be an issue	Site not suitable for development - too isolated from main settlement	Site not suitable for development - too isolated from main settlement	Site suitable for development - small development could extend existing ribbon of houses adjacent with small number behind	Site not suitable for development - development would extend village far beyond the nucleated heart despite being adjacent (extension) to previous allocation	Site possibly suitable for development - site would create piecemeal infill type development whereby residential dwellings would back onto each other unless sensitively designed to account for this; access could be an issue	Site not suitable for development - development could have a detrimental effect on the setting of a heritage asset	Site not suitable for development - dual carriageway runs along side site; site removed from village core

Sedgeberrow						
SHELAA Site Reference and Address:		CFS0539 Land south of Cheltenham Road	CFS0722 Land off Churchill Road	CFS0763 Ash Farm, Sandfield Lane	CFS0678 Land at Cheltenham Road	CFS1061 Whiteway, 67A Main Street
MAJOR CRITERIA	Is the site within or adjacent to a Town, Category 1, 2 or 3 Village?	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3	Category 3
	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
	Is the site within Flood Zone 1 or 2? If yes, state Flood Zone.		Flood Zone 1 - 100%			Flood Zone 1 - 100%
	Is the site more than 450 metres of hazardous pipeline or gas compression station?		NO			NO
	Can the site be provided with safe access onto the public highway?		Unknown			Unknown
	Are the Sewerage and Water supplies adequate in the area?		LOW level impact - 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			HIGH level impact - This site is a large increase in relation to the existing network, hydraulic modelling is recommended to determine impact
	Would development of the site compromise Internationally or Nationally designated site of ecological importance?		NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion			NO - unless infrastructure, air pollution or combustion
	Is the site in Green Belt?		NO			NO
	Is the site in the AONB, or affect the setting of?		NO			NO
	Is the site affected by an adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy or allocation? If yes, what?		NO			NO
Are the adjacent/surrounding land uses compatible with residential amenity? Please state what they are.		YES - residential development and school			NO - site is large and separated from development	
OTHER CRITERIA	Would development of the site have an adverse impact on Green Infrastructure Network?		TBC			TBC
	Would development of the site result in a significant net loss of protected open space?		NO			NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a conservation area or archaeology?		POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; Mitigation			POSSIBLY - Romano/British occupation-medieval potential; DBA, survey, targeted evaluation and possible mitigation
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on Listed Building (s).		NO			YES - Site access is in a sensitive location in terms of its proximity to listed buildings, although the rest of the site is relatively unobjectionable from a conservation perspective.
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on a Scheduled Ancient Monument?		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			YES
	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?		NO			NO
	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on ancient woodland?		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			YES - top part of the site affected by surface water from highway. Potential flows across the SW part of the site
	Would development of the site result in a loss of best or most versatile (Grade 1 or 2) agricultural land?		NO			PART - Grade 2
	Is the site on contaminated land? Is there contaminated land near to site, close enough to impact its potential development?		No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required			No History of PCL activities on site. Within 250m landfill buffer. Risk assessment required
	Is there a bus stop or train station within 400m of the site? Please state distance.		YES - 150m			NO
	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 - <100m, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A			PRIMARY SCHOOL - 950m, GENERAL STORE / POST OFFICE - N / A, DOCTORS SURGERY - N / A, PARISH / VILLAGE HALL - N / A
	Would development of the site result in an adverse impact on local health provision?		NO			YES
	Would development of the site assist in delivering / supporting Identified community infrastructure needs e.g. in Neighbourhood Plan.		NO			NO
Would the development of the site, including the creation of an access, materially affect the character of the settlement?		NO - development would be adjacent to existing development			YES - large site away from main developed area of village; would effectively double size of the settlement; Sedgeberrow is within the Landscape Type Principal Village Farmlands which has an identified settlement pattern of 'Nucleated pattern of expanded rural villages'. This proposal is for mixed use - dwellings should be resisted due to impact on settlement pattern; other land uses may be acceptable depending on the extent of built form, given the large area of this site.	
OUTCOME	Ruled in or out of SHELAA? If out, reason?	OUT - Flood Risk	IN	OUT - Location / Isolated	OUT - Duplicate (smaller cut)	IN
	Should the site be carried forward for potential allocation in the SWDPR?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Summary	Site not suitable for development - Flood Risk	Site not suitable for development - site comprises arable field with development backing onto it, poor access and would see an unnatural add on to the built form of the village	Site not suitable for development - isolated from main settlement	Site ruled out - duplicate	Site not suitable for development - too large and no obvious smaller cut to develop as would be unnatural to existing built form