

# Appendix C

## Bishop's Castle Place Plan Area Site Assessments


Published: August 2020

# Site Assessment Process Overview

## 1. Introduction

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

**Figure 1: Site Assessment Process**



Site Assessment Process	
<b>Stage 1: The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)</b>	Stage 1 consisted of a strategic screen and review of sites.
<i>Following the completion of the SLAA, further sites were promoted for consideration through the consultation and engagement process. Where possible these sites have been included within Stages 2a, 2b and 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process.</i>	
<i>Following the completion of the SLAA, further information was achieved through the consultation and engagement process. Where possible this information has been considered within Stages 2a, 2b and 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process.</i>	
<b>Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal</b>	Stage 2a consisted of the assessment of the performance of sites against the objectives identified within the Sustainability Appraisal.
<b>Stage 2b: Screening of Sites</b>	Stage 2b consisted of a screening exercise informed by consideration of a sites availability; size and whether there were obvious physical, heritage or environmental constraints present, based on the strategic assessment undertaken within the SLAA.
<b>Stage 3: Detailed site review</b>	Stage 3 consisted of a proportional and comprehensive assessment of sites informed by the sustainability appraisal and assessments undertaken by Highways; Heritage; Ecology; Trees; and Public Protection Officers; various technical studies, including a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Green Belt Assessment/Review where appropriate; consideration of infrastructure requirements and opportunities; consideration of other strategic considerations; and professional judgement. <b>This stage of assessment was an iterative process.</b>

## 2. The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

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

### **Assessing Suitability:**

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

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

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

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

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

#### 2.5. Reflecting upon the above factors:

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

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

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

#### **Assessing Availability:**

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

*requirements of landowners. This will often mean that the land is controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop, or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell”<sup>1</sup>.*

- 2.7. Within the SLAA, sites were generally considered to be available where they had been actively promoted for the relevant use during:
- The ‘Call for Sites’ exercise;
  - The Local Plan Review; or
  - Preparation of the current Local Plan (Core Strategy and SAMDev Plan).
- 2.8. Or where:
- There has been a recent Planning Application (whether successful or not) for the relevant use; or
  - Officers have particular knowledge about a site’s availability.

### **Assessing Achievability (including Viability)**

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

### **Conclusion**

- 2.10. Once the assessment of a site’s development potential; suitability; availability; and achievability (including viability) was undertaken and conclusions reached on each of these categories, an overall conclusion was reached.
- 2.11. Sites were effectively divided into three categories, these were:
- **Rejected sites:**
    - The site is considered unsuitable; and/or
    - The site is considered to be unavailable; and/or
    - The site is considered unachievable/unviable.
  - **Long Term Potential - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:**
    - The site is considered to be not currently suitable but may have future potential - subject to further detailed assessment; and/or
    - There is uncertainty about the sites availability; and/or
    - There is uncertainty about the sites achievability/viability.
  - **Accepted - Subject to Further Detailed Assessment:**
    - The site is considered currently suitable – subject to further detailed assessment; and
    - The site is considered available; and
    - The site is considered achievable/viable.
- 2.12. Various data sources were used to identify sites for consideration within the SLAA, including existing Local Plan Allocations (including proposals within adopted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans); Planning Application records; Local Authority land ownership records; a ‘Call for Sites’; and sites identified within previous Strategic Housing Land Availability (SHLAA) exercises. Ultimately, around 2,000 sites were considered within the SLAA process.

## **3. Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**

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

---

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

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

--	
-	
0	
+	

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

#### **4. Screening of Sites**

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

4.2. Specifically, sites did not proceed to Stage 3 of the site assessment process where:

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

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

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

*\*Significant physical constraints:*

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

*\*\*Significant natural environment/heritage constraints:*

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

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

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

**Please Note:**

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

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

## **5. Detailed Site Review**

5.1. Stage 3 of the Site Assessment process considered those sites which were not 'screened out' of the assessment at Stage 2b. It involved a detailed review of sites and selection of proposed site allocations. This stage was informed by:

- The results of Stage 1 of the Site Assessment process (which informs the assessment of sites).
- The results of Stage 2a of the Site Assessment process (which informs the assessment of sites).
- The results of Stage 2b of the Site Assessment process (which informs the site assessed).
- Assessments undertaken by Highways\*; Heritage; Ecology; Tree; and Public Protection Officers. In undertaking detailed reviews of sites within stage 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessment process, officers considered best available evidence\*\*, where necessary undertook site visits and applied professional judgement in order to provide commentary on each site.

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

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

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



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

**5.2. This stage of assessment was an iterative process.**

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

**Bishop's Castle  
Place Plan Area  
Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:  
Site Assessments**

# Key Centre: Bishop's Castle

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: BIS001	Site Ref: BIS004	Site Ref: BIS005	Site Ref: BIS006	Site Ref: BIS007	Site Ref: BIS008	Site Ref: BIS009	Site Ref: BIS010	Site Ref: BIS012	Site Ref: BIS013	Site Ref: BIS016	Site Ref: BIS017	
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>														
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>														
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>														
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Amenity green space		0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>														
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	
	GP surgery		-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
	Leisure centre		+	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
	Children's playground		+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Outdoor sports facility		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Amenity green space		-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>														
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area		0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0
a Listed Building	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>														
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
300m of a Listed Building	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)													
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)													
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)											+	+	
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded														
<b>Overall Score</b>			-1	-8	-4	-3	-2	-1	-1	-4	-3	-2	-1	2	
Range is 4 to -7 Good is 4 to 1 Fair is 0 to -3 Poor is -4 to -7 <b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			Fair	Poor	Poor	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	Poor	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair	

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:	Site Ref:
			BIS018	BIS019	BIS020	BIS021	BIS023	BIS024	BIS025	BIS026	BIS027	BIS027VAR	BIS028	BIS029
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>													
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>													
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Amenity green space		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	
	GP surgery		-	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+
	Leisure centre		+	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
	Children's playground		+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
	Outdoor sports facility		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Amenity green space		-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area		--	0	0	0	--	0	--	0	0	0	0	0
a Listed Building	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>													
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
300m of a Listed Building	-		-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)	+	+	+									+
Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded														
<b>Overall Score</b>			-1	4	0	-3	-7	-5	-6	-2	-6	-5	-4	-3
Range is 4 to -7 Good is 4 to 1 Fair is 0 to -3 Poor is -4 to -7 <b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref:	Site Ref:
			BIS030	BIS031
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>			
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>			
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0
	Amenity green space		0	0
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	-	+
	GP surgery		-	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-
	Leisure centre		+	-
	Children's playground		+	+
	Outdoor sports facility		+	+
Amenity green space	-		+	
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-	-		
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0
	a Conservation Area		0	0
a Listed Building	0		0	
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>			
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	-
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-
300m of a Listed Building	-		0	
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)		
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)		
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	0	0
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)		
Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded				
<b>Overall Score</b>			<b>-4</b>	<b>-2</b>
Range is 4 to -7 Good is 4 to 1 Fair is 0 to -3 Poor is -4 to -7 <b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>

# Community Hub: Bucknell

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: BKL001	Site Ref: BKL002	Site Ref: BKL003	Site Ref: BKL004	Site Ref: BKL005	Site Ref: BKL008	Site Ref: BKL008a	Site Ref: BKL009	Site Ref: BKL010	Site Ref: BKL011	Site Ref: BKL012	
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	--	--	--	0	--	0	--	0	0	0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>													
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	
	250m of a Wildlife Site		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>													
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Amenity green space		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	
	GP surgery		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	
	Leisure centre		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Children's playground		+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	
	Outdoor sports facility		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	
Amenity green space	-		-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	-		
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0		
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0		
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Conservation Area		0	--	0	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
a Listed Building	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>													
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		-	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	
300m of a Listed Building	-		-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-		
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)			0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)	+	+		+								
Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded														
<b>Overall Score</b>			<b>-5</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>-16</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-4</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-5</b>	<b>-3</b>	
<b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	
Range is -3 to -16 Good is -3 to -7 Fair is -8 to -12 Poor is -13 to -16														



# Community Hub: Chirbury

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: CHR001	Site Ref: CHR002
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>			
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>			
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0
	Amenity green space		0	0
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+
	GP surgery		-	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-
	Leisure centre		-	-
	Children's playground		+	+
	Outdoor sports facility		+	+
	Amenity green space		-	-
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-		-	
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0
	a Conservation Area		0	0
a Listed Building	0		0	
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>			
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		-	0
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-
300m of a Listed Building	-		-	
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)		
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)		
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	0	0
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)		
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded			
<b>Overall Score</b>			<b>-5</b>	<b>-4</b>
<b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			<b>-5</b>	<b>-4</b>
(Number of sites is too small to enable robust conclusion on Good/Fair/Poor rating)				

# Community Hub: Clun

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: CLU001	Site Ref: CLU002	Site Ref: CLU003	Site Ref: CLU004	Site Ref: CLU005
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>						
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	--	0	0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>						
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0	0	0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		-	-	-	-	0
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>						
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0	0	0	0
	Amenity green space		0	0	0	0	0
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	0	0	0	
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>						
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	-
	GP surgery		-	-	-	-	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-	-	-	-
	Leisure centre		-	-	-	-	-
	Children's playground		+	-	+	-	+
	Outdoor sports facility		+	+	+	+	+
Amenity green space	+		+	+	+	-	
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	+	+	+	+	-		
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	-	-	-	-	#N/A
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>						
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area		0	--	--	--	0
a Listed Building	0		0	0	0	0	
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>						
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		-	-	-	0	0
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-	-	-	-
300m of a Listed Building	-		-	-	-	0	
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)					
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)	-	-	-	-	
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)					0
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)					
Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded							
<b>Overall Score</b>			<b>-5</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-6</b>
<b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b> (Number of sites is too small to enable robust conclusion on Good/Fair/Poor rating)			<b>-5</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>-8</b>	<b>-6</b>

# Community Hub: Worthen and Brockton

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: WBR001	Site Ref: WBR003	Site Ref: WBR004	Site Ref: WBR005	Site Ref: WBR006	Site Ref: WBR007	Site Ref: WBR008	Site Ref: WBR008VAR	Site Ref: WBR009	Site Ref: WBR009VAR	Site Ref: WBR010	
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>													
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>													
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Amenity green space		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	
	GP surgery		-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
	Leisure centre		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Children's playground		+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	
	Outdoor sports facility		+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-	
	Amenity green space		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>													
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	a Conservation Area		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
a Listed Building	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>													
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	300m of a Conservation Area		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
100m of a Listed Building	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)												
Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded														
<b>Overall Score</b>			-1	-7	1	-3	1	-7	-7	-7	-3	-3	1	
<b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			Good	Poor	Good	Fair	Good	Poor	Poor	Poor	Fair	Fair	Good	
Range is 1 to -7 Good is 1 to -1 Fair is -2 to -4 Poor is -5 to -7														

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref:	Site Ref:
			WBR011	WBR007 & WBR008
1	<b>Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	Special Area of Conservation	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0
	National Nature Reserve		0	0
	Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0
	Ancient Woodland		0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0
Local Nature Reserve	0		0	
2	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>1</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>			
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve		0	0
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest		0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland		0	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	0
100m of a Local Nature Reserve	0		0	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
4	<b>Site contains one or more (or part) of the following<sup>2</sup> (record all that apply):</b>			
	Children's playground	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	Outdoor sports facility		0	0
	Amenity green space		0	0
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	0		0	
5	<b>Site boundary within 480m<sup>3</sup> of one or more of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	Primary School	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	-	-
	GP surgery		+	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		+	+
	Leisure centre		-	-
	Children's playground		-	-
	Outdoor sports facility		-	-
Amenity green space	-		-	
Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	-	-		
6	Site boundary within 480m <sup>3</sup> of a public transport node with a regular service offered during peak travel times <sup>4</sup> :	Yes = plus score (+) No = minus score (-)	+	+
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most versatile)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	-	-
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	Yes = plus score (+) No = zero score (0)	0	0
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
13	<b>Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that apply):</b>			
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = double minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument		0	0
	a Registered Battlefield		0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden		0	0
	a Conservation Area		0	0
a Listed Building	0		0	
14	<b>Site boundary within buffer zone<sup>5</sup> of one or more (record all that apply):</b>			
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	Yes = minus score (-) No = zero score (0)	0	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	0
	300m of a Registered Battlefield		0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden		0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		0	0
100m of a Listed Building	-		-	
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential	Double minus score (-)		
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)		
	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	3	6
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)		
Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity category is recorded				
<b>Overall Score</b>			<b>-5</b>	<b>-7</b>
<b>Overall Sustainability Conclusion</b>			<b>Poor</b>	<b>Poor</b>
Range is 1 to -7 Good is 1 to -1 Fair is -2 to -4 Poor is -5 to -7				

**Bishop's Castle  
Place Plan Area  
Stage 2b Screening of Sites:  
Site Assessments**



# Key Centre: Bishop's Castle

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS001</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Land at Grange Road, Bishop's Castle
<i>Settlement:</i>	Bishops Castle
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	5.53
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	166
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Mixed
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	90%
<i>General Description:</i>	The site is in agricultural use - grazing/pasture. Site rises gradually NE to SW. Boundaries mixed: W with Field Lane and N with Drews Leasow, E obvious field boundary but S and rest of N weaker with some hedgerow and tree presence.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	N - residential properties. E, S, and W agricultural fields.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS004</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adj. Windmill Cottage, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.51
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	45
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Agricultural - grazing/arable. Bounded to W by Castle Green/B4385 to N, E and S by agricultural land. SW by Windmill Cottage. Boundaries clearly defined by hedgerows/trees and B4385.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural fields.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS005</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Love Lane, Bishop's Castle
<i>Settlement:</i>	Bishops Castle
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	1.15
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	34
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	Agricultural field - unimproved grazing/arable. Site slopes down NW/SE towards main road. Single rectangular field, boundaries comprised hedgerows and scattered trees on all 4 sides. SE boundary with A488 (Love Lane), SW boundary with sawmill and timber yard, NW/NE boundaries with adjacent fields used for grazing. Site is separated from main town by agricultural land and sawmill.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	All agricultural with exception of sawmill/timber yard to SW.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS006</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adj. Wintles, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	3.87
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	116
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site to north of Wintles residential development. Currently in use for informal outdoor recreation and allotments (not recorded in PPG17 Study). Site rises generally from S to N but undulating within this. Bounded to S by Wintles residential properties, E by rear of properties on Castle Green, to W and N by agricultural fields (grazing/arable). Would form extension of existing settlement. Access off Wintles Rd, existing footpath network links possible via the Wintles. Strong boundaries with existing residential areas boundaries with surrounding fields to N and E mixed with some strong hedgerow and tree boundaries other less apparent.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agriculture to W and N residential to S and E.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS007</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Adj. Drews Leasow, Grange Road, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.21
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	36
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site adjoins E boundary of Drews Leasow affordable exceptions site and lies to N of BIS001. Site contains farm buildings (barns/storage) in N part and in use for agriculture - grazing. Site boundaries with Drews Leasow to E and residential properties to N (Grange Rd and Grange Gdns), E with Field Lane, S no discernible boundary with fields of BIS001. Potential access via Drews Leasow, Field Lane probably unsuitable. Links well to existing pedestrian linkages. Site rises gradually from N to S.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential properties to N and W. Field Lane to E. Agric fields - grazing land - to S as part of BIS001. Site adjoins BIS001 and extends into open countryside to S of town.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS008</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Schoolhouse Land East, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.93
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	58
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Agriculture - grazing/pasture. Site comprises the higher 2 of 3 fields adjacent to the development boundary between Schoolhouse Lane and Love Lane (the A488); the lower field is BISH005 (Love Lane). Additionally, previous now allocated site BISH009 (opposite the surgery) lies immediately west of this site and between it and the town. Land slopes down west to east with some uneven ground near the western boundary of the site. Boundaries not well defined with surrounding fields although established well defined line of hedgerow and trees separating the two fields that make up the site. Access via Schoolhouse Lane, pedestrian footpath connecting to town centre and amenities.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agriculture to north, east and south (including BISH009). Schoolhouse Lane to the north. Boundaries comprise hedges with some mature trees.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS009</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Opposite Surgery, Schoolhouse Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	4.07
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	122
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site lies to N of industrial estate to S and W of School house Lane. Moderately downward sloping to SE towards S and W. Boundaries clearly defined with surrounding employment and residential uses some of these boundaries also marked by hedgerows and trees. N boundary with adjoining fields less well defined. No highway frontage so access not clear, no obvious pedestrian connections.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agriculture to N, Residential properties to E, employment uses to S and W.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS010</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Site between Nover/Ridge and Grange Road
<i>Settlement:</i>	Bishops Castle
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	1.02
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	31
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	<p>Agricultural field - grazing. Adjacent agricultural/commercial use in NW corner. Slightly upwards sloping to west and south. Joined on east, north and west by existing housing development.</p> <p>Boundary hedgerows and some significant trees. Boundaries are mixed with some outgrown, some gappy hedgerows, some with trees. Site has open boundary to remainder of field to south. Access to currently obvious no road frontage. Pedestrian access could join existing network via Grange Rd. Reasonably contained by existing built form on 3 sides.</p>
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	E, N and W existing residential properties, S open grazing fields.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	<p>Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident.</p> <p>To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.</p>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS012</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Castle Street, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	2.07
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	62
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site comprises the higher of two fields used for agriculture - grazing adjacent to the development boundary north of the town centre, between Castlegreen and Schoolhouse Lane. This site lies east of Castlegreen between the town and Windmill Cottage. The lower field is BIS013. Residential properties off Castlegreen (B4385) to the west, agriculture to the north and east and residential to the south. Sloping downwards west to east and also north to south but with an area of flatter land in the highest western and northern parts of the site. Site includes affordable housing completed at Clove Piece see BIS003x. Boundaries defined by hedgerows and trees to N, E and S and B4385 to W. Road frontage onto B4385 potential access from SE via Schoolhouse Lane is dependent upon BISH013. There are possibilities for pedestrian links to the town centre no existing pavement on B4385.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Castlegreen to the west, agriculture to the north and east and residential to the south including new Clove Piece affordable housing.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS013</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off School House Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	2.48
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	74
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Agricultural fields - grazing pasture. Bounded on all sides by agricultural use. To south is allocated site (BISH013 Schoolhouse Lane East.) Boundaries are defined by hedgerows and trees on S, W and N and by Schoolhouse Lane (B4384) on E. Site is divided roughly in half by line of overgrown hedgerow trees running NE - SW. Site is bisected SE-NW by extant pp for 33kv overhead power lines. Site slopes significantly downwards west to east.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural fields.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS016</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Field adj. Blunden Hall, Brampton Road, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.51
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	15
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site lies on N corner of A488 and Brampton Rd and is currently private open space associated with Blunden Hall. Site is within the development boundary bounded by residential properties of Brick Meadow to the N and Bowling Green Close to the W. Boundaries are clearly defined by the A488 , Brampton Rd and the neighbouring residential developments. Site is relatively flat and could be accessed via existing access to Blunden Hall, A488 or Brampton Rd. Pedestrian access is good with links to existing network possible.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential; also opposite secondary school/college on Brampton Rd and opposite Business Park on A488.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Currently Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS017</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land bet Station St and Bowling Green Close, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.61
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	18
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Mixed
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	25%
<b>General Description:</b>	Site within development boundary currently comprises part informal car park for Boars Head pub and remainder is open space/vacant. Some established mature trees on site and surrounded by existing residential properties. Potential access via Station Street but no road frontage as such. Boundaries clearly defined by adjacent properties. Pedestrian links possible to existing network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential properties within conservation area to N, S and W; Modern bungalow development of Bowling green Close to the E.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Currently Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS018</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adj Brampton Rd, rear of Bowling Green Close, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.55
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	16
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Private garden land encompassing mature trees and shrubs, sheds etc. Flat site boundaries clearly defined by adjacent properties and Brampton rd. Site is the conservation area and has road frontage to Brampton Rd on S boundary. Pedestrian access via links to existing network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential. Also opposite secondary school and college on other side of Brampton Rd.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Currently Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS019</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Livestock market, Station Street, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.41
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	12
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Brownfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Brownfield site. Current livestock market, site includes car parking, lairage, storage, offices etc. Site comprised hard standing car park and buildings. Site has frontage onto Station rd. and is surrounded by mix of uses including some retail, residential and pub. Boundaries set by neighbouring properties and Station Rd. Existing established pedestrian links.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Central location in town surrounded by residential properties and other town centre uses.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Not Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<p><b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b> As the site is considered to be unavailable for residential development, it will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</p> <p><b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b> As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other Promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p><b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b></p>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS020</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Rear of surgery, Schoolhouse Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.43
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	13
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site is agricultural land - rough grazing and informal recreation. Site is within development boundary and lies between existing built up area and allocated site. Site boundaries are clearly defined by existing property to S and E; W by Schoolhouse Lane (B4384); N is not clearly defined remnant hedgerow and field boundaries only. Site slopes downwards from NW to SE and has narrow access onto Schoolhouse Lane (B4384), links to existing pedestrian network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural fields to N and W; residential properties to E and S - including existing GP surgery.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Currently Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Not Currently Available - Likely to become so
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b> <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS021</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to west of Oak Meadow, Bishops Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	5.18
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	155
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site - currently agricultural land arable/grazing. Site lies to west of settlement, south of Welsh Street, west of Oak Meadow and north of Kerry Lane. It comprises two full fields and part of a further field, which form the lower part of a small valley with a stream. Site slopes upwards (SW to NE) from existing residential development. Road access onto Kerry Lane, new pedestrian links would have to be created. Boundary to the west is not consistently or always clearly defined as the southern part of the site forms part of a larger field.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agriculture to W and S. Residential to N and E.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS023</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Woodbine Terrace, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.22
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	7
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site to the south of the town centre, off Church Lane in the gap south of Hollenbough. Outside but adjacent to development boundary. Wooded, remnant orchard now overgrown. Small site flat, very slight slope upwards from north to south. Residential gardens to north and south, Church Lane and properties to east, similar wooded overgrown field to west.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential gardens to north and south, Church Lane and properties to east, similar wooded overgrown field to west.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b> <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS024</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adj. White Lodge Drs Surgery, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	3.27
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	98
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Large greenfield agricultural fields some distance from town and development boundary in open countryside. Site consists of 2 fields grazing/arable with frontage onto A488 at White Lodge. Boundaries consist of field hedgerows and trees not strongly defined on W. No established pedestrian links significantly removed from town and facilities. Site has significant upward slope to NW.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Surrounded by agricultural land
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS025</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land East of Field Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.20
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	6
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently used as rough grazing and informal open space. Site boundaries comprised in the main of hedgerows and established mature trees especially with E boundary with BIS023. Site is accessed by Field Lane - single track unpaved access track. Site has boundaries with BIS023 to E and agricultural land to W and S and existing residential development to N. Site is currently subject to appeal following refusal for one dwelling due to conflict with development plan.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural and residential.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. However, the site is adjacent to other promoted sites with a combined site area of greater than 0.5ha (and the other site is considered available and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b> <b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS026</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	East of Schoolhouse Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.85
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	56
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Elongated greenfield site to E of Bishops Castle outside and removed from development boundary. Site is currently in use for grazing and has boundaries on all sides comprised of trees and hedgerows with a number of mature established trees in hedgerows and area of woodland at NW corner of site. Site has road frontage to Schoolhouse Lane and A488 to S current vehicle access is via Schoolhouse Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via Schoolhouse Lane (pavement) to established networks in Bishops Castle. Site is surrounded by countryside/farmland with some scattered dwellings.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural/countryside.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>This site in isolation has no road frontage or potential point of access. However, there are other promoted sites which could provide this site a road frontage (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS027</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Church Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.63
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	19
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary, Currently in agricultural use for rough grazing. Site has farmland/countryside on all four sides as well as some residential development on N and W boundaries on all four sides comprised hedgerows and trees. Site is accessed via Church Lane and has frontage to this as well but Lane is single track only already serving a number of residential properties.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Farmland/countryside and limited residential.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS027VAR</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Church Lane, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.94
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	28
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site consisting of two agricultural fields divided by Church Lane, outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for rough grazing. Site has farmland/countryside to east, west and south and a mix of farmland/countryside and some residential development to the north. Site boundaries consist of agricultural field boundaries (hedgerows and trees) and Church Lane. Site is accessed via Church Lane and has frontage to this as well but Lane is single track only already serving a number of residential properties.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Farmland/countryside and limited residential.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	N/A
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS028</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Welsh Street, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	4.11
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	123
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	The site consists of a series of fields located to the north and south of Welsh Street, to the north east of Bishop's Castle.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Character to the north, south and west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly residential.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS029</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Bishop's Castle Business Park - Phase 2, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	2.46
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	74
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Scrubland currently allocated for employment development. The site would represent an extension to the adjacent successful Phase 1 Business Park.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	To the east is a business part and sewerage treatment works. To the south is a playing field. To the west are allotments, natural screening and beyond the A458 residential development. To the north are agricultural fields.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS030</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Church Road, Bishops Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.19
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	6
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	The site is a triangular area of vacant land within the wider setting of Bishops Castle Community College. It is directly accessible from Church Road.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Surrounding uses include sports pitches; a Leisure Centre, the Community College; residential properties and agricultural fields.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<p><b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b></p> <p><b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b> As the site is less than 0.5ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other Promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p><b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b></p>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS031</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Welsh Street, Bishop's Castle
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bishops Castle
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.02
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	31
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	The site represents a portion of a wider agricultural field. The sites southern boundary is undefined. The sites northern boundary is also currently undefined, however this land has Planning Permission for affordable housing. The sites western boundary is defined by an agricultural field boundary. The sites eastern boundary is a mix of residential property curtilages/undefined.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Land to the north is currently agricultural but has Planning Permission for affordable housing. Land to the south and west is predominantly agricultural. Lane to the east is predominantly residential.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	N/A
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

# Community Hub: Bucknell

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL001</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Field opposite the Junior School, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.45
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	44
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Thee site comprises two small fields close to the centre of the village and sits within the development boundary. The fields are in agricultural use and are very gently undulating in nature.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The site is close to the centre of the village and is therefore surrounded by a variety of uses. To the south of the site, on the opposite of the road is the railway line and station. To the west, on the opposite side of the road is the primary school and cemetery whilst to the remaining sides is low density residential development.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Currently Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL002</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	The Old Farm, Bucknell
<i>Settlement:</i>	Bucknell
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	3.15
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	95
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	This relatively large site sits near the centre of the village and is within the development boundary. The site is formed of a number of fields in agricultural use and is gently undulating in character. The eastern portion of the site is also separately assessed as BKL004.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	The site is primarily surrounded buy residential development surrounded although there is a small petrol station to its south east corner
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Currently Suitable
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL003</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Hill Farm, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.42
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	12
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	The site comprises two adjacent fields with a frontage to Bridgend Lane which are currently in agricultural use. The land slopes gently upwards to the north from Bridgend Lane. The site is neither within nor adjacent to the development boundary.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The south the site is fronted by Bridgend Lane beyond which is further agricultural land. The site is bound to the north and west by agricultural land and to the east by the buildings associated with Hill Farm
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL004</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Grazing in the Centre of the Village, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	2.15
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	64
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	This site sits near the centre of the village and is within the development boundary. The site is formed of a number of fields in agricultural use and is gently undulating in character. The site forms the eastern portion of BKL002 which is assessed separately
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The site is bound to the east by the B4367 to the opposite side of which is residential development which also borders the site to the north east and north. There s a small petrol station to its south east corner To the west of the site is agricultural land
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Currently Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL005</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land west of The Tyndings, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.25
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	38
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	The site is formed of a single field in current use for livestock grazing and is bound to the north by the lane serving the Tyndings. In character the site is fairly flat before it starts sloping upwards at its southern boundary.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	To its north the site is bound by the lane serving the Tyndings to the other side of which are the rear of some properties which face onto Bridgend Lane. The site is bound to the west and south by country lanes and to the east by the development known as the Tyndings
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL008</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adj. Redlake Meadow on B4367, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.96
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	59
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	A site to the south of the B4367 and to the eastern edge of the built form of the settlement. The site is comprised of a single field in agricultural use.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The site is bound to the north by the B4367 to the opposite side of which is a heavily screened yard. To the west is the built form of the settlement. The south is bound by further agricultural land and the River Redlake. To the east is further agricultural land.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL008a</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Phase 1 - Land adj. Redlake Meadow on B4367, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.85
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	25
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	A site to the south of the B4367 and to the eastern edge of the built form of the settlement. The site is comprised of part of an agricultural field.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The site is bound to the north by the B4367 to the opposite side of which is a heavily screened yard. To the west is the built form of the settlement. The south is bound by further agricultural land and the River Redlake. To the east is further agricultural land.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL009</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land south of Bridgend Lane, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.84
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	25
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	A long narrow site formed of a single field currently on agricultural use. The site is flat in character.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The site is south of the lane and has similar fields to either side. To the north of the lane is a children's play area and existing residential development.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL010</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land Adjoining Ladywell, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.20
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	36
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	A small site that wraps around existing development. Currently used for agricultural purposes the land is gently undulating in nature. The site is adjacent to the development boundary.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The adjacent area to the site's south west that is already developed is recent residential development. The remaining surrounding area remains in agricultural use.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL011</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Timber Yard / Station Yard, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.14
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	34
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Mixed
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	Approx. 50%
<b>General Description:</b>	The site consists of part of a Station Yard site to the south of Bucknell (now vacant) - this element of the site is allocated for employment development, the remainder of the site to the south is allocated for residential development.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Character to the east and west is primarily agricultural. Character to the south consists of employment (remainder of the site) beyond which is agricultural. Character to the north is primarily residential.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL012</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Bucknell Station, Bucknell
<b>Settlement:</b>	Bucknell
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.06
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	<5
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	A small linear site consisting of vacant/garden land. Site boundaries are defined by the railway line to the north, a road to the south, a property curtilage to the west and are undefined to the east.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential and agricultural.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	N/A
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<p><b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b></p> <p><b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b> As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the other promoted site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</p> <p><b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b> The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.</p>
<b>Summary:</b>	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

# Community Hub: Chirbury



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CHR001</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land between Orchard House and Crofton, Chirbury
<b>Settlement:</b>	Chirbury
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.26
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	8
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site comprises a field in agricultural use (grazing) to the west of the B4386 heading towards Hockleton Bridge.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Land to the east and west is in agricultural use, land to the north and south is in residential use.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CHR002</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land south of the A490, Chirbury
<b>Settlement:</b>	Chirbury
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.29
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	9
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	A linear site located to the south of the A490. The site forms part of an agricultural field.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Surrounding land uses are primarily agricultural and residential. The site lies opposite land allocated for residential development.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup> :</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

# Community Hub: Clun

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU001</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land north of Llwyn Road, Clun
<b>Settlement:</b>	Clun
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.67
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	20
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site comprises a field in agricultural use (grazing) to the west of Mount Pleasant and the north of Llwyn road.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agriculture (grazing) to the north, west and south. Residential to the east.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:                      Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU002</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adjacent St George's Church, Clun
<b>Settlement:</b>	Clun
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.45
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	14
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site comprises a field in agricultural use (grazing) to the south of St Georges Church and to the east of Hand Causeway.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	St Georges Church to the north, residential to part of the west, agriculture (grazing) to remainder of west, south and east.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	The site forms part of a Local Wildlife Site.
<b>Summary:</b>	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU003</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adjacent to The Hall, Vicarage Road, Clun
<b>Settlement:</b>	Clun
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.11
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	<5
<b>Type of Site:</b>	
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site comprises a field containing orchard style trees to the south of Vicarage Road, between the Vicarage and the Hall.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Residential to west, north and east, agriculture to south.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Suitable - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b> <b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b> <b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b> As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU004</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land south of Vicarage Road, Clun
<b>Settlement:</b>	Clun
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.12
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	<5
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Site comprises a field in agricultural use behind the Vicarage and off the lane leading to Woodside Farm.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	The Vicarage lies to the west, residential to the north, agriculture to the east and south.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the site is less than 0.2ha, it is not in isolation considered to be of sufficient size to allocate for residential development. Due to the size and location of the site it is not considered to have potential for allocation as part of a wider site (it is either not adjacent to another promoted site, or the adjacent site is not considered available and/or the strategic assessment has identified a significant constraint).</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU005</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Extension of B4368, East of Clun
<b>Settlement:</b>	Clun
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.00
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	30
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	The site consists of part of an agricultural field located adjacent to the existing residential allocation in Clun.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Character to north and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is a mix of employment, open space and residential. Character to the west is currently agricultural, however this land has been allocated for residential development.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	N/A
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.
<b>Summary:</b>	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



# Community Hub: Worthen and Brockton

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR001</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land north of Brockton Brook, Brockton
<b>Settlement:</b>	Brockton
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.60
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	48
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Large greenfield site currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops on NW edge of Brockton. Site has agricultural land to N, S, and W; to E are farm buildings, farmhouse and 4 properties on Crow Hill Lane. Boundaries to N and W not clearly defined on ground - arbitrary line across larger field; boundaries to S and E defined by lane to Hampton Beech and fencing respectively. Site has road frontage to lane to Hampton Beech but current vehicle access from smaller field on E. Pedestrian and cycle links via lane (no pavement) to village and B4386 to established network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Open countryside in agricultural use.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Availability Unknown
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.</b>
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR003</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adjoining Brookside Close, Worthen
<b>Settlement:</b>	Worthen
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.84
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	55
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site on SE corner of Worthen. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/pasture and fodder crops, site acts as buffer between residential development on Brookside and Rectory Gardens and sewage treatment works adjoining SE corner of site. Site therefore has existing residential development on N boundary of site otherwise surrounded by agricultural land with exception of STW. Site boundaries are clearly defined by hedgerows and trees (some quite established) on all sides. W boundary also has watercourse running along it. Site has no road frontage and currently vehicle access is via surfaced access road to STW. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to existing established links - no pavement provision. Approx. 90% of site within flood zones 2 or 3.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural/open countryside with residential development to N.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Suitable
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>The majority of the site is located within flood zones 2 and/or 3.</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR004</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the West & South of the Primary School, Brockton
<b>Settlement:</b>	Brockton
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	4.51
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	135
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Large greenfield site on E edge of Brockton occupying land between settlement and primary school also including portion of large field S of and adjoining B4386. Site currently in agricultural use for grazing/pasture and fodder crops. Site has residential estate development to E and N, primary school to W and B4386 to S and then additional portion of site which has agricultural use E, S and W. Site boundaries comprised hedgerows on all sides augmented in some places by fencing especially on E boundary with primary school. Site has road frontages and current vehicle access both to B4386 and to Croft Close/Brockton Meadow on W. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to established network - pavement provision in both cases. S portion of site has a recent refusal for residential development. SE corner of N portion has outstanding permission for new GP surgery.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Built development on 3 sides of larger N portion. S portion on opposite side of B4386 is surrounded by agricultural use.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR005</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Land off B4386, Brockton
<i>Settlement:</i>	Brockton
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	0.77
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	23
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	Greenfield site on SW edge of Brockton currently in agricultural use for rough grazing/paddock. Site has property adjoining NW corner and individual properties to N; otherwise site has agricultural land on all sides. Site boundaries clearly defined by hedgerows/trees except on NE boundary where defined by fence. Site has remnants of existing hedgerow and couple of established trees across centre of site. Site has road frontage and current vehicle access to B4386. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route to established network - no pavement provision.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	Open countryside.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR006</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off the Hawthorns, Brockton
<b>Settlement:</b>	Brockton
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	1.74
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	52
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site to W of Brockton currently in agricultural use for grazing/pasture. Site has existing residential estate development of Oakfield Close and the Hawthorns to W, current agricultural land as SLAA site WBR004 to S and further agricultural land to N and E. Site boundaries are clearly defined by tree/hedgerows and residential properties on W, S and E but N boundary is not physically defined - arbitrary line across field. Site does not have road frontage as such and current vehicle access is via larger element of field to N. Pedestrian and cycle access via PROW along S edge of site to established network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Agricultural/open countryside apart from residential development to W.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR007</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land east of Bank Farm, Worthen
<b>Settlement:</b>	Worthen
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.71
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	21
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Small greenfield site on NE edge of Worthen. Site is currently in agricultural use for rough grazing/pasture. Site has agricultural buildings of Bank Farm to W along with residential properties to SW and S on opposite side of B4386; further agricultural land to N and E of site. Site has boundaries clearly defined by hedgerows to N,S and E and fencing to W and part of N boundary. Site has road frontage to B4386 to S but current vehicle access is via farmyard of Bank Farm. Pedestrian and cycle access not obvious though PROW across site - no pavement provision.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Edge of village character - agricultural and open in appearance with some residential properties.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR008</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Bank Farm, Worthen
<b>Settlement:</b>	Worthen
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.56
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	17
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site comprising agricultural buildings and former slurry pit to N of village centre. Site is comprised entirely of agricultural buildings, hard standing, storage areas and former slurry pit with no vegetation except on boundaries. Site adjoins residential properties to W and S and further agricultural land to the N and E (SLAA site WBR007). Site boundaries are clearly defined with adjoining development to S and W and by trees/hedgerows to N and E. Site does not have road frontage and current vehicle access is via Back Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route (no pavement provision) to established network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Edge of village character - agricultural and rural in appearance with some residential properties.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	Suitable - subject to assessment and management of physical, environmental and/or heritage constraints
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.



**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR008VAR</b>
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Bank Farm, Worthen
<b>Settlement:</b>	Worthen
<b>Site Size (Ha):</b>	0.86
<b>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</b>	26
<b>Type of Site:</b>	Greenfield
<b>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</b>	N/A
<b>General Description:</b>	Greenfield site comprising agricultural buildings and former slurry pit to N of village centre. Site is comprised entirely of agricultural buildings, hard standing, storage areas and former slurry pit with no vegetation except on boundaries. Site adjoins residential properties to W and S and further agricultural land to the N and E (SLAA site WBR007). Site boundaries are clearly defined with adjoining development to S and W and by trees/hedgerows to E, the sites northern boundary is undefined. Site does not have road frontage and current vehicle access is via Back Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access via same route (no pavement provision) to established network.
<b>Surrounding Character:</b>	Edge of village character - agricultural and rural in appearance with some residential properties.
<b>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</b>	N/A
<b>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Currently Available
<b>Achievability/Viability Information:</b>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	<b>The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR009</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Land off Back Lane, Worthen
<i>Settlement:</i>	Worthen
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	3.15
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	94
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	The site consists of two agricultural fields and a field containing several barns/agricultural buildings. Site boundaries are defined by property curtilages to the north, south and east and agricultural field boundaries to the west.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	Land to the north and west is predominantly agricultural. Land to the east and south is predominantly residential.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>
	<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>
	<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR009VAR</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Land off Back Lane, Worthen
<i>Settlement:</i>	Worthen
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	0.59
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	18
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	The site consists of an agricultural field. Site boundaries are defined by an agricultural field boundary to the north, woodland to the west, property curtilages and woodland to the east and property curtilages to the south.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	Land to the north and west is predominantly agricultural. Land to the east and south is predominantly residential.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	N/A
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR010</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Land south of B4386 Millfield, Worthen
<i>Settlement:</i>	Worthen
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	2.24
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	67
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	A linear site consisting of a triangular agricultural field and part of a very large agricultural field. The sites northern boundary is defined by the B4386, the sites eastern and western boundaries are defined by property curtilages, the sites southern boundary is in the majority undefined cutting across an agricultural field.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	Character to east and west is residential. Character to the immediate north is residential beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the south is agricultural.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Site Assessment - Stage 2b**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR011</b>
<i>Site Address:</i>	Bank Farm, Worthen
<i>Settlement:</i>	Worthen
<i>Site Size (Ha):</i>	0.30
<i>Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):</i>	9
<i>Type of Site:</i>	Greenfield
<i>If mixed, percentage brownfield:</i>	N/A
<i>General Description:</i>	The site consists of Bank Farm house and its large curtilage. Site boundaries are defined by the road to the west and south-east, a property curtilages to the south-west and east, and an agricultural field boundary to the north.
<i>Surrounding Character:</i>	Character to the north is agricultural, character to the east, west and south is residential.
<i>Suitability Information: (from SLAA)</i>	N/A
<i>Availability Information<sup>1</sup>:</i>	Currently Available
<i>Achievability/Viability Information:</i>	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
<b>Conclusion:</b>	
<b>Availability<sup>1</sup>:</b>	
<b>Size<sup>2</sup>:</b>	
<b>Strategic Suitability<sup>3</sup>:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b>	<b>Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.</b>

<sup>1, 2 and 3</sup> Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

**Bishop's Castle  
Place Plan Area  
Stage 3 Detailed Site Review:  
Site Assessments**

# Key Centre: Bishop's Castle

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS001</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	via Drews Leasow
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	N. Traffic from 195 homes will be unacceptable on Kerry Lane which is very narrow in places.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	12
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA and the Environmental Network, which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Much of site adjacent to corridor of Env. Network. Suggest seek landscape advice.



<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey), reptiles. Environmental Network along eastern and southern boundaries.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management) and water quality issues. Ideally connect to the sewage treatment plant which has additional phosphate stripping capacity. Protected and priority species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries and trees and hedges within site. Green buffer required to Environmental Network to east and south. Open space to be linked to green buffer.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Site located on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the Bishop's Castle Conservation Area. Large site and HER indicates the NW corner may contain earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 04565), so site has archaeological interest archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + ?evaluation; impact on setting of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Field boundary trees and hedges around and across site with a number of significant mature trees on the site. The site surrounds on three sides a block of woodland in the South-east section of the site. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS005</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium and Medium-Low
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium and Medium-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	A488 but not ideal as this would represent a detachment from the town.
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	In order to achieve a more integrated approach to access it would be preferable for this site to have vehicular and pedestrian access to School House Lane via BIS008 or possibly through existing employment sites.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	14
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Field boundary trees and hedges around and across site with a number of significant mature trees on the site. The site surrounds on three sides a block of woodland in the South-east section of the site. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges / existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably considers, incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	Noise, potential dusts and odour from existing commercial activities along the whole length of the southern boundary.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Significant mitigation would be required and even then likely issues could arise.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS008</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	School House Lane
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>14</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds within 500m), Dormice, Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey), reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries and within site. Maintain semi-natural eco network corridor running west to east to link across northern extent of town.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Site located c. 40m N of the boundary of, and potentially within the setting, of the Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact character and appearance on setting of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature established and possibly important hedgerows surround the site on three sides the roadside hedgerow would almost certainly be lost to accommodated a visibility splay. The South-west boundary along side the timber mill is defined by the remnants of a hedgerow and a young to early mature tree planting scheme (Screen planting for the mill). These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and this merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Retention of existing hedgerows for compensatory planting (as required) Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges / existing off site trees. The shelter belt / screen planning at the mill will mature to high trees casting shade across the site for large parts of the day, development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Commercial operation to south east has potential to be noisy and produce odours.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Separation distance to the south east border of the site recommended as the best idea with glazing specification however additional layout, orientation, barriers/boundary treatment could be employed.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	



<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS010</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	2%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	7%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	via Grange Rd or Woodbatch Rd
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	Y. Possible safety improvements needed at Grange Rd / Kerry La junction
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	13
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey), reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and preferably in boundaries.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	HER indicates earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 08592) may be present across the whole site, so may have some archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + Level 2 earthwork survey).
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	There are a number of mature trees on site and along the potential access routes to this site. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. The two potential access routes overlap with a public footpath and establish landscape planting and trees that would probably need to be lost to accommodate access routes therefore compensatory planting would need to be intrinsic to any new development layout. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Existing commercial migrating into the centre of the proposed plot.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Relevant assessments on noise etc. would be required to establish what mitigation is necessary.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS012</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	12
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (Ponds within 125m), Dormice, Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles. Immediately adjacent to Environmental Network to south and west.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on boundaries. Provide a semi-natural corridor linked to open space along the south-western and southern boundary to link the environmental network across the site.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system and connect arms of the Environmental Network.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	SW corner of site located within and S boundary of site located immediately adjacent to the boundary, and within the setting, of the Bishop's Castle Conservation Area. Site also located c.80m north, and potentially within the setting, of the Scheduled Monument of Motte and bailey castle and bishops' palace (NHLE ref. 1020552). Medium sized site on edge of historic core of town - map have some archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment; assessment on impact character and appearance and setting of CA + impact on setting of the Scheduled Monument). High quality design for residential development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Boundary hedgerows (Possibly important) and a small number of boundary trees. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS013</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>14</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (Ponds within 500m), Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on boundaries. Provide a semi-natural corridor linked to open space along the northern boundary to link to the scrubland to the north.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Medium sized site on edge of historic core of town - may have some archaeological potential. Site also falls beyond the existing built edge of the town and development likely to be incongruous within the immediate rural surroundings
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment +?evaluation)
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Boundary hedgerows (Possibly important) and one central hedgerow; a small number of boundary trees with a block of scrub / emergent woodland to the north of the site. Access off School Lane would require a wide visibility splay which would require the removal of a large section of hedgerow. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. Compensatory planting for any length of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Road to the south east border will produce noise as could kennels.



<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Separation distance, layout, orientation, barriers/boundary treatment, glazing specification as necessary. Separation from kennels necessary as dog barking can generate significant complaint.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS016</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Onto Brampton Road
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>15</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland/orchard needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on, and preferably within boundaries.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Provide semi-natural open space for residents of Bishop's Castle.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	Site located adjacent to, and within setting of, Grade II* listed Blunden Hall and Old Hall Cottage (NHLE ref. 1054574)
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (setting of LB). High quality design for residential necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the LB.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature hedgerows and trees on the north and south boundaries, with a number of semi mature field trees planted 10 to 20 years ago and now starting to have an impact on the character and amenity of the area. The trees to the south will have a shading effect on the site and these and other mature trees adjacent to the site could pose other proximity related constraints. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Road to the east and south of the site will create noise.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Stand off distance, layout and orientation, barriers/bunds/boundary treatment, glazing specification.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS020</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>14</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Labelled as a core area in the environmental Network which would be covered by CS17 and MD12. No or only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland/orchard needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on, and preferably within boundaries. Potentially reduce housing density or avoid site altogether if priority habitat.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Provide semi-natural open space for residents of Bishop's Castle.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Site located on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (assessment on setting of CA ). High quality design for residential development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature hedgerows and trees on the north-east boundary , with a number of semi mature trees in the gardens of the p[roperties tot he south-west. The trees to the south have potential as they grow to have a shading & overbearing effect on the site. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. There is little room for compensatory planting and new development therefore any proposed development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows. Possible opportunity for strategic planting of one or two roadside trees at the entrance of Schoolhouse Lane
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Road noise likely at entrance to the site.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Separation distance recommended with additional layout, orientation, barriers/boundary treatment, glazing specification as necessary.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS021</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	2%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	10%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Oak Meadow
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	Consideration should be given to providing vehicular access to this site through the current playground area and replacing this facility within the development. Access onto Kerry Lane may be difficult due to ground levels.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	If Kerry Lane can accommodate the additional traffic. It may not be wide enough west of Oak Meadow to achieve necessary improvements.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	15
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision.



<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds immediately adjacent and within 500m), Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles, possibly water voles. Environmental Network crosses the site from west to east along a damp spring-line.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and inside boundaries. Retain and enhance spring line/ditch with a buffer of semi-natural vegetation, preferably within the open space required for residential development.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Link open space to surrounding green corridors to enhance Env. Network. Provide access to green space from surrounding existing housing.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	S end of site previously contained earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 08711), although likely to have been effected/ removed by recent arable cultivation. No other known archaeology but large size of site suggests there may be some potential.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	Access off Kerry lane would destroy mature hedgerows and trees and interrupt an important habitat corridor.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature established and possibly important hedgerows surround much of the site. The Kerry roadside hedgerow is an important habitat corridor and should be accommodated in a sustainable layout. Mature trees in and alongside the site and potentially important hedgerows define much of the boundary and cross the site. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and this merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges / existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably considers, incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges / existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably considers, incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No significant constraints.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS023</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Onto Church Lane
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	OK given scale this development proposal.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	Y. But only after careful consideration is given to the cumulative impact on Church Lane of several proposed developments.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	11
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. The whole site has been left to naturalise for a significant amount of time and lies entirely within the corridor of the Environmental Network.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland/orchard needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and inside boundaries. Retain natural vegetation links to north-east and west. for Env. Network.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Only damage likely.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located partially within Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Site located partially within Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	The site is formed by a paddock which has started to scrub up with self set trees and maturing hedgerow trees forming a tree canopy back drop to the area. Dense development at this site is likely to be at the cost of the existing natural environment features. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. There is little room for compensatory planting and new development therefore any proposed development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows. Possible opportunity for strategic planting of one or two roadside trees at the entrance of Schoolhouse Lane
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS024</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium and Medium-Low
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium and Medium-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Onto A488 but would be preferable to access School Lane via BIS026
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>13</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. Site lies between two parts of the Environmental Network.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland/orchard needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on boundaries. Retain natural vegetation links to north-east and south-west for Env. Network. via open space provision which should also link to retained hedges.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements, link two parts of Env. Network corridor and access to greenspace for existing housing. However, long way from existing development boundary.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Site located on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the non-designated historic parkland of Lydham Manor Park (HER PRN 07745). Medium sized site - may have some archaeological potential. Site also falls beyond the existing built edge of the town and development likely to be incongruous within the immediate rural surroundings
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment +?evaluation; impact on setting of historic parkland)
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary with a number if significant mature trees along the south-west boundary. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Where sections of hedge are lost for access this should be compensated for by the establishment of new native hedgerows along the boundary of the visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Kennels to the south of the site and road to the east of the site.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Separation distance from the kennels to the south as it would not be acceptable to place additional constraints on existing business. A range of options to mitigate road noise are available including layout, orientation, barriers/boundary treatment, glazing specification as necessary.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	



<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS025</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Via Field Lane onto Church Lane
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	OK given scale this development proposal.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	Y. But only after careful consideration is given to the cumulative impact on Church Lane of several proposed developments.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	11
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. The whole site has been left to naturalise for a significant amount of time and lies entirely within the corridor of the Environmental Network.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EclA required. Surveys for Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland/orchard needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Only damage likely.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located partially within Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Site located partially within Bishop's Castle Conservation Area.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	The site is formed by a hedge lined paddock with mature trees on the north boundary and maturing hedgerow trees on the east boundary forming a tree canopy back drop to the area. Dense development at this site is likely to be at the cost of the existing natural environment features. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees. There is little room for compensatory planting and new development therefore any proposed development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows. Possible opportunity for strategic planting of one or two roadside trees at the entrance of Schoolhouse Lane
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS026</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Onto School House Lane
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>14</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds present within 500m), Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and inside boundaries. Retain natural vegetation links to north-west.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Depending on ecological value of habitats on site, could form semi-natural open space for residential sites either side if allocated.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Archaeological earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 32670) recorded at the north-western end of site . Site also falls beyond the existing built edge of the town and development likely to be incongruous within the immediate rural surroundings
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation [Level 2 earthwork survey]).
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	0.3ha young plantation at the west end of the site
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary with a number if significant mature trees along the south north west and west boundaries and a ; the southern trees in particular will have an overbearing impact upon any dwellings built to close to them.. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Where sections of hedge are lost for access this should be compensated for by the establishment of new native hedgerows along the boundary of the visibility splay. The 3ha new plantation at the east end of the site should be retained as a screen and could be incorporated as part of the landscape mitigation. This is a relatively narrow site and development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	Kennels to the south of the site could have a significant impact on residential development. Dog barking travels over significant distances and can be very annoying causing complaint.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Road noise.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	For road noise stand off distance, layout and orientation, barriers/bunds/boundary treatment, glazing specification. For kennels I feel such a significant separation distance would be necessary that most of the site may be lost.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS027</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Onto Church Lane
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	OK given scale this development proposal.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	Y. But only after careful consideration is given to the cumulative impact on Church Lane of several proposed developments.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	11
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds present within 500m), Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and inside boundaries. Retain natural vegetation links to particularly to south and west.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary with a number of significant mature trees along the south & west boundaries. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. The mature trees (mostly ash trees) have potential to have an overbearing influence across a significant area of the site . These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Where sections of hedge are lost for access this should be compensated for by the establishment of new native hedgerows along the boundary of the visibility splay. The site is prominent in the landscape and requires significant long-term landscape mitigation along the eastern boundary to incorporate the site into the landscape. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	



Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS027VAR</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Onto Church Lane
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	OK given scale this development proposal.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	N
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	Y. But only after careful consideration is given to the cumulative impact on Church Lane of several proposed developments.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	11
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA, which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows and trees will need to be buffered.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
Ecology Comments Opportunities:	
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	Mature important hedgerows form the site boundary with a number of significant mature trees along the south & west boundaries. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. The mature trees offer an important screen to the site but have potential to have an overbearing influence across a significant area of the site . These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Where sections of hedge are lost for access this should be compensated for by the establishment of new native hedgerows along the boundary of the visibility splay. The site is prominent in the landscape and requires significant long-term landscape mitigation along the eastern boundary to incorporate the site into the landscape. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining boundary trees and hedgerows.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS028</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Northern site: Y Southern site: Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Northern site: Onto Welsh Street or The Wintles (due to be adopted in 2018). Southern site: via Oak Meadow and through BIS028n to the Wintles
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Northern site: N Southern site: Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	Northern Site: N. Welsh Street is not suitable for the traffic generated by approximately 60 homes. Y. Once the Wintles Road is adopted and access can be prevented along Welsh Street. Southern site: But access arrangement should not enable development traffic to access the town centre (or travel through the town centre) via Welsh Street.
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Northern site: N Southern site: Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	Northern site: Y. If traffic can access the town via the Wintles / Castle Green and not go via Welsh Street. Southern site: Assumes development traffic will not access town centre via Welsh Street.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	15
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA , which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds present on site and within 500m), Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles. Environmental Network immediately adjacent to the north-east corner of the site.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected and priority species and habitat mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and inside boundaries. Retain natural vegetation links to particularly along the eastern boundary and internal hedges. retain pond and semi-natural vegetation around it.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system and Environmental Network along water course.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Northern part of site includes an historic farmstead site (HER PRN 24318). Would development involve demolition - if so impact on heritage interest of site would be higher?
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic buildings survey if demo of farmstead involved)
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature established and possibly important hedgerows surround the northern plot and parts of the southern plot and cross the centre of the north plot. A small number of mature trees on the boundaries of the site. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Retention of existing hedgerows. Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges / existing off site trees. Mature high trees have potential to cause proximity issues where development is inappropriate but this can be designed out. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows. The site is large enough to incorporate meaningful long-term structural planting through sustainable design and landscape provision.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	The site is split into two distinct areas, north and south. The southern plot is considered a good site for residential with no objections from a regulatory services perspective. In relation to the northern plot there is commercial existing to the eastern boundary however it is not considered likely that this will impact significantly on residential development.

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS029</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	6%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	7%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	16%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	9%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	8%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Not assessed
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	<b>11</b>
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA and the environmental network, which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.



<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	EclA required. Surveys for GCN (ponds adjacent and within 500m), Dormice, vascular plants (possible species-rich semi-improved grassland and other habitats needs botanical survey) Badgers , Bats, nesting birds, reptiles. Environmental Network immediately adjacent to the north-west and south-west corners of the site.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	See LPR HRA for mitigation methods for recreational issues (e.g. larger open space or contributions to visitor management). Protected and priority species and habitat mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines and mature trees on and inside boundaries. Retain 10 plus metre buffer to the adjacent watercourse. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements. Link open space to existing hedgerow system and Environmental Network along water course.
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Established hedgerows and shelterbelt planting adjacent to the NW / NE & SE boundaries of the site. The shelter belt in particular has potential to grow larger and create proximity problems in the future if layout and density is not sustainable. The boundary hedges are important screens to the site and need to be retained and potentially supplemented with maiden tree planting to break up the sky line of any new development. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Retention of existing hedgerows. Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges / shelterbelt trees. Mature high trees have potential to cause proximity issues where development is inappropriate but this can be designed out. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining woodland and on site field trees and hedgerows. The site is large enough to incorporate meaningful long-term structural planting through sustainable design and landscape provision.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	Potential odour from treatment works unmanageable making residential in the south east part of the site unsuitable in my opinion.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Potentially manageable however significant potential impacts on any new residential from existing and any future commercial development of the site.

<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Dependant on assessment however significant separation distances may be required reducing the space available for development on site.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BIS031</b>
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:	Yes
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)	Medium
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?	Y
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?	Assumes the site is being promoted because it can secure access onto the Oak Meadow cul-de-sac.
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Y
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?	Y
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?	If Kerry Lane can accommodate the additional traffic.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	14
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on Stiperstones and Hollies SAC and water quality impacts on the River Clun SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA, which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible.

<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds. Hedgerows will need to be buffered.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Mature established and possibly important hedgerows define the west and east boundaries. These features are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Retention of existing hedgerows. Landscape buffers between new development and boundary hedges and compensatory planting at the development to the north (see 18/04411/FUL). Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows. The site is large enough to incorporate meaningful long-term structural planting through sustainable design and landscape provision.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	

Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Bishop's Castle. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

# Community Hub: Bucknell

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL001</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	No
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	33%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	5%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	None
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	None
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Lane from the B4367 passing school
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Provided development delivers new footway along frontage of site.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Need footway link with existing footway on B4367 and pedestrian crossing facility to accessing school and school warning signage.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Site lies within Env. Network corridor. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site immediately adjacent to boundary Bucknell Conservation Area and may effect it's setting. Site is also located immediately adjacent to historic core of the village and may therefore have archaeological potential
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA, archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Mature oak on the sites west boundary. Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary and dissect the site. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Railway noise to the south. School to the west will cause some noise to be heard but not anticipated to be an issue.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	This very gently undulating greenfield site sits on the south-western edge of Bucknell close to the Shropshire Area of Natural Beauty. The site is located opposite the primary school and fronting onto the lane through the village off the B4367. The site is close to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and any development would need to take account of any adverse effects on this designated site. The unnamed lane would accommodate a highway access into the site but would require a new frontage footway linking to the existing village network with a pedestrian crossing and signage for the Primary School. The site would be exposed to the noise effects from the railway immediately to the south requiring an appropriate design solution. The enclosure of the site into the built form of the settlement removes any landscape sensitivity and the site has no risk of flooding being within Flood Zone 1 however, there is a surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site also lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat which should be restored and enhance on the site. The site is open with boundary hedgerows and a mature oak on the western boundary offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has heritage value adjoining the Bucknell Conservation Area and close to the Castle scheduled ancient monument requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site is considered to have one of a Good Sustainability Rating reflecting the lower environmental sensitivity of the site and the proximity of some key local services.



<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this moderate sized site despite the proximity of some key local services. Other sites in Bucknell such as BKL008a is better suited to meet the housing guideline, offers greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create a more attractive gateway into the village. In contrast site BKL001 would lead to the loss of a significant open site that contributes to the character of the village.</p> <p>The development of BKL001 would extend the current built form and layout of the village into a location that already receives considerable peak traffic flows on a significant blind corner on the local highway network. It is also considered that the distance from other services located to the east may deter pedestrians from walking into the village even though the development should provide footways linking to the existing village network.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL002</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	7%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	20%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	80%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	2%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	10%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	None
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	None
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4367
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	<p>If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed.</p> <p>The river/LWS will need to be adequately buffered, reducing the developable area available.</p> <p>Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.</p>
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	<p>The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The river forms Env. Network core area. A PROW crosses the site.</p> <p>Part of the site is within the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site boundary. Potential impacts will need to be assessed and SWT will need to be consulted.</p> <p>Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish (known to be present), reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.</p>
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	<p>If priority habitat, the site should not be developed.</p> <p>If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.</p>

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	SW side of site includes part of a Scheduled Monument of Motte castle and ice house 30m south of The Old Farm (NHLE ref. 1012867) - this would need to be excluded from any allocation.
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Potential to affect the settings Scheduled Monument, together with settings of the Grade II listed building of The Old Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1366994); Barn, cart entrance and loose box c. 40m west of The Old Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1054985); and Ice House immediately SE of The Old Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1054986). Site also located partially within, and adjacent to the boundary of, the Bucknell Conservation Area, and development could therefore effects its character and appearance and setting. Include site of former saw mill (HER PRN 02575) and proximity to the castle and historic core of the village suggests the wider site may have archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of SM, LBs; impact on setting and character and appearance of CA; archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Mature trees on the sites boundaries some of which are protected by the conservation area. Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary and cross the site y. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints noted.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	This gently undulating greenfield site sits in the centre of the village close to the Shropshire Area of Natural Beauty and is crossed by a Public Right of Way. The eastern site frontage onto the B4367 provides a possible highway access point subject to a suitable junction configuration. The site contains part of the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site which should be buffered for protection, reducing the developable area of the site. The enclosure of the site into the built form of the settlement removes any landscape sensitivity. The site does have significant Flood Zone 2 with a small Zone 3 along River Redlake and a slight surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site also lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat which is possible. A Botanical Survey will be required and any priority habitat should be restored and enhance on the site. The site is open with mature tree and hedgerow boundaries offering habitat for protected or priority species and requiring compensatory planting should highway works remove boundary trees or hedgerows. Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments are required with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network especially along the River Redlake. The site has heritage value lying partially within the Bucknell Conservation Area enclosing listed buildings, the Castle Motte Monument and protected trees requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Fair Sustainability Rating reflecting the higher environmental value modified by proximity to some key local services.

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this larger site which exceeds the housing guideline despite the proximity of some key local services. Other sites in Bucknell such as BKL008a is better suited to meet the housing guideline, offers greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create a more attractive gateway into the village. In contrast, the development of BKL002 would consolidate the current open form and layout of the village in a sensitive location. Site BKL002 therefore represents a more challenging development option due to the environmental value of the site that contributes significantly to the natural and historic character of the village. It is also considered that the distance from other services located to the west may deter pedestrians from walking even though the development should provide footways linking to the existing village network.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL004</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	4%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	17%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	83%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	3%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	9%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	None
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	None
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4367
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	<p>If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed.</p> <p>The river/LWS will need to be adequately buffered, reducing the developable area available.</p> <p>Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.</p>
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	<p>The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The river forms Env. Network core area. A PROW crosses the site.</p> <p>Part of the site is within the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site boundary. Potential impacts will need to be assessed and SWT will need to be consulted.</p> <p>Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish (known to be present), reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.</p>
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	<p>If priority habitat, the site should not be developed.</p> <p>If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.</p>

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Potential to affect the settings Scheduled Monument, together with settings of the Grade II listed building of The Old Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1366994); Barn, cart entrance and loose box c. 40m west of The Old Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1054985); and Ice House immediately SE of The Old Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1054986). Site also located partially within, and adjacent to the boundary of, the Bucknell Conservation Area, and development could therefore effects its character and appearance and setting. Proximity to the castle and historic core of the village suggests the wider site may have archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of SM, LBs; impact on setting and character and appearance of CA; archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	Some very limited scope for development at N end of site but would need to be very carefully designed.
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Mature trees on the sites boundaries some of which are protected by the conservation area. Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary and cross the site . Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints noted.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	This gently undulating greenfield site is crossed by a Public Right of Way. BKL004 forms the eastern part of site BKL002 close to the Shropshire Area of Natural Beauty. The site BKL004 sits in the centre of the village with an eastern site frontage onto the B4367 providing a possible highway access point subject to a suitable junction configuration. This part of site BKL002 is still located close to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and any development would need to take account of any adverse effects on this designated site. The enclosure of the site into the built form of the settlement removes any landscape sensitivity. This part of site BKL002 still has significant Flood Zone 2 with a small Zone 3 and a slight surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site also lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat which is possible. A Botanical Survey will be required and any priority habitat should be restored and enhance on the site. The site is open with mature tree and hedgerow boundaries offering habitat for protected or priority species and requiring compensatory planting should highway works remove boundary trees or hedgerows. Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments are required with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network especially along the River Redlake. The site has heritage value lying partially within the Bucknell Conservation Area enclosing listed buildings, the Castle Motte Monument and protected trees requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site has a Fair Sustainability Rating reflecting the higher environmental value modified by proximity to some key local services.

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this larger site which exceeds the housing guideline despite the proximity of some key local services. Other sites in Bucknell such as BKL008a is better suited to meet the housing guideline, offers greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create a more attractive gateway into the village. In contrast, the development of BKL002 would consolidate the current open form and layout of the village in a sensitive location. Site BKL002 therefore represents a more challenging development option due to the environmental value of the site that contributes significantly to the natural and historic character of the village. It is also considered that the distance from other services located to the west may deter pedestrians from walking even though the development should provide footways linking to the existing village network.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL005</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	No
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	2%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Lane north of site
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Assumes a suitable access and footway can be delivered within the site frontage.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	N. The Lane to the east of the site - leading to the village - is narrow with no footway and improvements are not deliverable.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	Buffering of the adjacent woodland may reduce the developable area available. Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Part of the site is Env. Network corridor. The adjacent woodland will need to be adequately buffered. The site is adjacent to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site. Potential impacts will need to be assessed and SWT will need to be consulted. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12



<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	HER contains two records relating to finds of prehistoric flints (HER PRN 02786 & 03030), suggesting the site has archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary and cross the site. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees on the south boundary which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints noted.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	This fairly flat greenfield site sits on the western edge of Bucknell within the Shropshire Area of Natural Beauty. The site is close to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and any development would need to take account of any adverse effects on this designated site. The site would need a vehicular access from the north off Chapel Lawn Road providing a frontage footway and avoiding placing any access demands on the narrow lane to the east. The site is fairly flat to the north but rises towards its southern boundary creating a medium landscape sensitivity and a medium-low visual sensitivity. The site has no risk of flooding being within Flood Zone 1 but has a slight surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site also lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for the water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site is open with mature boundary and field hedgerows offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has recorded archaeological finds suggesting the need for a Heritage Assessment. The site is considered to have a Good Sustainability Rating reflecting the lower environmental sensitivity of the site and its proximity of some key local recreational facilities in the village.

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this moderate sized, which still exceeds the housing guideline, despite the proximity of some key local recreational facilities. Other sites in Bucknell especially BKL008a are better suited to meet the housing guideline, offer greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create a more attractive gateway into the village. In contrast, the development of BKL005 would extend the built form of Bucknell into the AONB and consolidate development in this more remote part of the village. Site BKL005 therefore represents a more challenging development option due to the environmental value of the site that contributes significantly to the natural and historic character of the village. It is also considered that the distance from other services located to the east may deter pedestrians from walking even though the development should provide footways linking to the existing village network.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL008</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	11%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	89%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	19%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4367
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Existing 30mph speed limit and village gateway signs and lines to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided. Footway needed at site frontage with crossing point to footway on north side of road.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Provided short length of new footway provided to link to existing footway on north side of B4367.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. The river/LWS will need to be adequately buffered, reducing the developable area available. Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The river forms Env. Network core area and the western boundary forms a corridor. Part of the site is within the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site boundary. Potential impacts will need to be assessed and SWT will need to be consulted. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, otters, water voles, white-clawed crayfish (known to be present), reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Mature trees along the South-East boundary. Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary and cross the site. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees on the south boundary which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints noted.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>This flat greenfield site sits on the eastern edge of Bucknell adjacent to the designated landscape of the Shropshire Area of Natural Beauty. The site contains part of the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site which should be buffered for protection recognising its core role in the Environmental Network and reducing the developable area of the site. The northern site frontage onto the B4367 provides the highway access point subject to a suitable junction configuration, footway linking in to the existing network and repositioning of the 30mph and village gateway signage. The site is flat and adjoins the AONB creating a medium landscape sensitivity and a medium-low visual sensitivity. The site has some Flood Zone 2 and slight Zone 3 with a slight surface water flood risk in severe conditions. The site also lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for the water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat which should be restored and enhanced on the site. The site is open with mature boundary and field hedgerows offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has no known heritage value. The site is considered to have a Poor Sustainability Rating reflect the environmental value of the site and the distance to the key local services but this may be mitigated through the measures noted above and also by providing a footpath link into the southern area of the adjacent Redlake Meadows development providing a more direct and safer access to the key services in the village.</p>

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>There is a more preferable option for utilising the advantages of this site, such as the proximity of some key local services, than developing this larger site which exceeds the housing guideline despite. The smaller sub-divided site of BKL008a is better suited to meet the housing guideline, offers greater opportunities for planning gain in proportion to the required scale of development, better access to the local highway network and could still create an attractive gateway into the village. In contrast, the development of the whole site BKL008 represents a more challenging development option due to the environmental value of the site that contributes significantly to the natural character of the village. It is also considered that the distance from other services located to the west may deter pedestrians located in the southern portion of BKL008 from walking even though the development should provide footways linking to the existing village network although a footway into the Redlake Meadow development would address this matter.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL008a</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	20%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4367
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Existing 30mph speed limit and village gateway signs and lines to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided. Footway needed at site frontage with crossing point to footway on north side of road.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Provided short length of new footway provided to link to existing footway on north side of B4367.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. The western boundary forms an Env. Network corridor. Potential impacts on the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site will need to be assessed and SWT will need to be consulted. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Mature potentially important hedgerows form the site boundary and cross the site. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees on the south boundary which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints noted.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>This flat greenfield site sits on the eastern edge of Bucknell adjacent to the designated landscape of the Shropshire Area of Natural Beauty and forms the northern portion of site BKL008. The site is close to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and any development would need to take account of any adverse effects on this designated site. The northern site frontage onto the B4367 provides the highway access point subject to a suitable junction configuration, footway linking in to the existing network and repositioning of the 30mph and village gateway signage. The site is flat and adjoins the AONB creating a medium landscape sensitivity and a medium-low visual sensitivity. This northern portion of the site has no known flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and no surface water flood risk. The site lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for the water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat which should be restored and enhanced on the site. The site is open with mature boundary hedgerows offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has no known heritage value. The northern area of this larger site has a Fair Sustainability Rating reflecting the lower environmental sensitivity of this northern part and the improved proximity to services from the northern portion of the site. This may be further improved by providing a footpath link into the southern area of the adjacent Redlake Meadows development providing a more direct and safer access to the key services in the village.</p>

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Allocate for housing development</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>This is the preferred site for development in the village. This smaller, subdivided site will deliver a scale of development consistent with the housing guideline for Bucknell. The site offers a better opportunity to meet the needs of the community with the potential to provide a footpath link into the southern area of the adjacent Redlake Meadows development providing a more direct and safer access to the key services in the village. This site therefore has a reasonable relationship to the built form of the settlement and will provide a highway access directly to the B4367 with the possibility of delivering highway improvements and much needed traffic calming measures. The development of this open site on the eastern entrance to the village also offers the opportunity to create an attractive village gateway. The development of this site, whilst lying in the countryside, offers the potential to consolidate the current built form and layout of the village requiring an appropriate design scheme and layout. This design scheme should respect the open character and environmental values of the site and the special qualities of the adjacent landscape within the Shropshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	20
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>BKL008a is located on the edge of the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) adjoining the existing Redlake Meadow development. BKL008a comprises the B4367 road frontage and northern portion of a larger land parcel and must facilitate development of the remaining land at some future time. Design, layout and landscaping of the development should respect the historic character of the settlement, enhance the character of the AONB, contribute to the countryside setting beyond the eastern boundary of the site and create a new gateway for the village (in addition to traffic calming measures). A footway link into the Redlake Meadow estate should also be considered. The gateway feature is to be formed by the provision of a suitable and safe highway access with appropriate visibility onto the B4367 and highway drainage to help address surface water flooding, provision of a footway, along the site frontage with an appropriate road crossing to link to the wider pedestrian network and bus stop to the north, reposition the speed restriction beyond the new junction with signage and traffic calming to mark the entrance to Bucknell. Relevant supporting studies to be undertaken particularly highway capacity, ecology, tree and hedgerows, drainage and protection of the River Clun SAC. Recommendations to be clearly reflected in the development scheme. Regard is to be had to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and retaining mature trees and hedgerows where possible with compensatory planting especially for hedgerow removal to create the highway access to B4367. The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water flood risk may be managed on part of the remaining land to ensure flood and water management measures do not displace water elsewhere.</p>



<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL010</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High and Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High and Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4367 and Dog Kennel Lane
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Existing 30mph speed limit and village gateway signs and lines to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided. Footway needed at site frontage. No vehicular access onto Dog Kennel Lane.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Provided short length of new footway provided to link to existing footway on north side of B4367.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Two mature / veteran oak trees occupy prominent positions in the landscape at this site. The site is on raised ground and within the AONB therefore its visibility and need for landscape mitigation will be of key importance the sustainable credentials for development at this site.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees on the south boundary which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints noted.
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>This very gently undulating greenfield site sits on the south-western edge of Bucknell, opposite the primary school and fronting onto the lane through the village off the B4367. The site is close to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and any development would need to take account of any adverse effects on this designated site. The unnamed lane would accommodate a highway access into the site but would require a new frontage footway linking to the existing village network with a pedestrian crossing and signage for the Primary School. The site would be exposed to the noise effects from the railway immediately to the south requiring an appropriate design solution. The enclosure of the site into the built form of the settlement removes any landscape sensitivity and the site has no risk of flooding being within Flood Zone 1 however, there is a surface water flood risk in severe conditions. However, the site lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for the water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat. The site is open with boundary hedgerows and a mature oak on the western boundary offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has heritage value adjoining the Bucknell Conservation Area and close to the Castle scheduled ancient monument requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site is considered to have a Fair Sustainability Rating reflecting the lower environmental sensitivity and the proximity of some key local services.</p>

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>There are more preferable sites available within the settlement which offer better opportunities to meet the needs of the community than this moderate sized site despite the proximity of some key local services. Other sites in Bucknell such as BKL008a have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement, offers greater opportunities for planning gain, better access to the local highway network and could create a more attractive gateway into the village. In contrast site BKL010 would lead to the loss of a significant open site that contributes to the character of the village. The development of BKL010 would extend the current built form and layout of the village into a location that already receives considerable peak traffic flows on a significant blind corner on the local highway network. It is also considered that the distance from other services located to the east may deter pedestrians from walking into the village even though the development may provide footways linking to the existing village network.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>BKL011</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	No
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	3%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B 4367
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	N. Difficult to cater for/improve situation for pedestrians and provide for a pedestrian crossing. Site entrance is opposite a road junction, close to a railway line crossing and sharp bend in the road.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	(Also site extremely close to railway line).
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. Buffers from hedgerows/tree lines/railway will reduce developable area. Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front. Site known to hold significant bat roosts requiring dark commuting routes. Would recommend not allocating this site.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Most of the site is Env. Network corridor. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site represent the former railway yard (HER PRN 32794) and appears to include the former railway goods shed, which is likely to be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset because of it's relationship to the railway. There may be other railway related structures on the site.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (Level 2 historic building assessment of good shed).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	Opportunities should be sought conserve and sensitively convert/ integrate the former goods shed into any scheme.
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site contains a number of mature trees and lines of trees these help screen the site from neighbouring views and so can be considered of value to the character and amenity of the area.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees on the south boundary which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Contaminated land likely due to past land use. Noise from railway likely.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Contaminated land remediation likely to be available. Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for railway noise.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	This very gently undulating greenfield site sits on the south-western edge of Bucknell, opposite the primary school and fronting onto the lane through the village off the B4367. The site is close to the River Redlake Local Wildlife Site and any development would need to take account of any adverse effects on this designated site. The unnamed lane would accommodate a highway access into the site but would require a new frontage footway linking to the existing village network with a pedestrian crossing and signage for the Primary School. The site would be exposed to the noise effects from the railway immediately to the south requiring an appropriate design solution. The enclosure of the site into the built form of the settlement removes any landscape sensitivity and the site has no risk of flooding being within Flood Zone 1 however, there is a surface water flood risk in severe conditions. However, the site lies in the water catchment of the River Clun Special Area of Conservation requiring a Habitat Regulations Assessment with full drainage information to protect priority habitat and protected species and for the water quality impacts possibly leading to mitigation measures including the phasing of development. The site will not be developable if found to support priority habitat. The site is open with boundary hedgerows and a mature oak on the western boundary offering habitat for protected or priority species requiring Ecological and Arboricultural Assessments with appropriate conservation, retention, mitigation / enhancement including compensatory planting to sustain the site character and its function in the Environmental Network. The site has heritage value adjoining the Bucknell Conservation Area and close to the Castle scheduled ancient monument requiring a Heritage Assessment. The site is considered to have a Good Sustainability Rating reflecting the lower environmental sensitivity and the proximity of some key local services.

<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as existing mixed use allocation</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	The SAMDev Plan (2015) currently identifies a comprehensive mixed use strategy to deliver 100 dwellings and 1.4 hectares of employment land for Bucknell in the period 2006 to 2026. This existing mixed use allocation for residential (70 dwellings) and employment (1.4 hectares) uses forms the greater part of this development strategy for Bucknell for the period to 2026. It is therefore proposed that this existing allocation is retained to continue to meet the development needs of the community of Bucknell for the revised Local Plan period 2016 to 2036 .
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

# Community Hub: Chirbury

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CHR001</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	No
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4386
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Existing 30 limit and village entry sign and school warning signage may all need to be reviewed and any necessary traffic calming. New length of footway along site frontage to be provided along with crossing point to link with existing footway on east side of road.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.



<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site located close to the former precinct of Chirbury Priory (HER PRN 02570)
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	This is a gateway to Chirbury good design and landscape integration are important. The roadside and boundary hedgerows potentially meet the criteria for importance as set out in the 1997 Hedgerows regulations and are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12. Removal of a large section of hedgerow to provide a visibility splay for the new access would need to be compensated for.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Possible noise from road to south.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	-5

<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings located to the north and south of the site.</p> <p>The site is located within a landscape sensitivity parcel which is considered to have medium-high landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The existing highway is not currently suitable for traffic associated with the development at the access point, however this can be achieved through reviewing/relocating signage and speed zone; introduction of necessary traffic calming measures; provision of a length of footway along the sites frontage; and a crossing point to link with the footway on the east of the road.</p> <p>HRA will be required for cumulative impact on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site may contain priority habitats.</p> <p>The site is in proximity of the former precinct of Chirbury Priory.</p> <p>Boundary hedgerows are valued (may comply with criteria for importance in the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations) and integral to the character and amenity of the area.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Road to south is a potential source of noise.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	<p>Any loss of hedgerows would require compensatory provision.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	<p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p>
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<p>No</p>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<p>Yes</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>Allocate for residential development.</p>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings located to the north and south of the site.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	<p>7 dwellings</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>Design, layout and landscaping of development should respect village character and complement its gateway location. It should also safeguard historic environment assets and integrate into the natural environment.</p> <p>Mature trees and hedgerows should be retained where possible and compensatory planting should occur.</p> <p>A pedestrian footway should be provided along the site's road frontage. An appropriate road crossing will also be necessary, to link into the wider pedestrian network.</p>

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CHR002</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	No
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	A490
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Existing 30 limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided and footway provided along site frontage .
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Assumes it is possible to create a continuous footway on the south side of the A490 into the village within existing highway.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site has potential to affect setting of Chirbury Conservation Area.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (setting of CA).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	Design will need to address relationship of the site to the Conservation Area
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	This is a gateway to Chirbury good design and landscape integration are important. The roadside hedgerow potentially meets the criteria for importance as set out in the 1997 Hedgerows regulations and are integral to the character and amenity of the area and to the local mosaic of habitat corridors and stepping stones and thus merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12. Removal of a large section of hedgerow to provide a visibility splay for the new access would need to be compensated for.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Road noise from the northeast. Potential noise, odour and dust from agricultural activities to the north of the site.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Noise mitigation available and could include stand off distance, glazing and ventilation consideration and layout and orientation of dwellings, barrier treatment and combinations thereof to mitigate for all noise sources. Stand off distances and more of the above sentence to mitigate against potential agricultural impacts. If barns close to site used for livestock the site is unsuitable for residential.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	-4

<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>The site is well located to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings to the west and an allocated site to the north.</p> <p>The existing highway is not currently suitable for traffic associated with the development at the access point, however this can be achieved through provision of a length of footway along the sites frontage.</p> <p>The development would also require off-site highway works, specifically creation of a continuous footway on the southern side of the A490 into the village.</p> <p>HRA will be required for cumulative impact on the Stiperstones and Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site may contain priority habitats.</p> <p>The site may impact on the setting of the Chirbury conservation area.</p> <p>Boundary hedgerows are valued (may comply with criteria for importance in the 1997 Hedgerow Regulations) and integral to the character and amenity of the area.</p> <p>Road to north-east is a potential source of noise.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Agricultural activities in the surrounding area may be a source of noise, odour and dust.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	<p>Any loss of hedgerows would require compensatory provision.</p> <p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	<p>Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.</p> <p>See comments from relevant service areas.</p>
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<p>No</p>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<p>Yes</p>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>Allocate for residential development.</p>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The site is well related to the built form of the settlement, with dwellings located to the north and south of the site.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	<p>7 dwellings</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>Design and layout of development should respect village character and complement its gateway location. It should also safeguard historic environment assets and integrate into the natural environment.</p> <p>The 30mph zone should be extended to reflect the extent of this site (and the existing allocation to the north).</p> <p>A continuous footway should be provided along site sites road frontage and into the village.</p> <p>Mature trees and hedgerows should be retained where possible and compensatory planting should occur.</p>

# Community Hub: Clun

**Site Assessment - Stage 3**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU001</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Llwyn Road
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Existing 30 mph speed limit to be extended and any necessary traffic calming provided. Quiet Lanes approach could help?
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Provided lane is sufficiently quiet. Not possible to add footways.
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	N/A
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	There is a pond adjacent to the western boundary. If GCNs are present, a 50m buffer around the pond will be required. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	With the exception of hedgerows there are no significant existing tree constraints' at this site. But the local topography means that the site is high in the landscape and will be very visible to views from the surrounding AONB. integration of any development at this site needs to comply with local and national policies on good design and landscape integration.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Any full proposed site layout needs to have been designed around sustainable landscape mitigation this will have a bearing on the density and layout of development at this site.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features (Hedgerows) and through the use 20% canopy cover policy to extend sustainable tree and woodland cover at the site.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints identified.
<b>Sustainability Appraisal Conclusion:</b>	-5
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	The site is located outside the development boundary but adjoins the built form of the settlement on its southern edge. Being elevated above the surrounding development with no significant tree cover, although bounded by hedgerows, the site is within a Landscape Sensitive parcel that has 'high' landscape and visual sensitivity. The site is not affected by a known flood risk but a full drainage assessment, ecological assessments and HRA will be required to ensure adequate conservation, mitigation and enhancement of the habitat and populations of protected and priority species that use the site and to retain / enhance the local Environmental Network. These matters are significant considerations that would affect the scale, density and layout of any potential development which should also make a contribution to increasing tree canopy cover in the locality. The access to the site would be along Llwyn Road but this could not provide for a pedestrian footway to the site and increased vehicular access into Llwyn Road would require the 30mph speed restriction to be extended further to the south of the village. The site has a unique setting within Clun being one of only two towns in Shropshire which are completely enclosed within the Shropshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas particularly in relation to highways, ecology and trees.



<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Remain as Countryside</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>CLU001 is in a visually prominent position elevated above the settlement and requires investigation of potential habitat for protected or priority species. The site is visually sensitive when viewed from the town, river valley and higher ground to the south and may impact upon the setting of the heritage assets of Clun Castle and the medieval town. Located to the south of Clun and accessed via the Clun Bridge river crossing, the site is less accessible to the facilities and services within the town and would place increased pressure on the Bridge from the additional traffic movements to/ from development on the site. There are other preferable locations for development in Clun.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

**Site Assessment - Stage 3**

<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>CLU005</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	10%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	10%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	20%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4368
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Assumes development will fund an appropriate estate road access for potentially 30 homes and a review and extension of the existing 30mph speed limit with any necessary traffic calming.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	
<b>Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store &amp; Public Transport Service):</b>	N/A
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	Site lies within water catchment of the River Clun SAC - a HRA will be required and full drainage information will be required up front.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers and nesting birds. There are TPO'd trees on the site. A PROW runs along the northern boundary.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	See accompanying document
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Potential impact on settings of Clun Conservation Area and Grade II* Wardens House and Chapel Associated with Trinity Hospital (NHLE ref. 1054456).
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of CA & LBs)
<i>Heritage Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	None identified
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	The roadside facing of the site is marked by an established hedgerow, this would need to be breached to provide access and a visibility splay.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Compensatory planting for any lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. There is ample room for compensatory planting and new development therefore any proposed development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features along with new planting.
<i>Tree Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	Integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features (Hedgerows) and through the use 20% canopy cover policy to extend sustainable tree and woodland cover at the site.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Other Constraints:</i>	Commercial use separated from site by road in southeast. Potential road noise.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Management of Constraints:</i>	Potential to mitigate noise through separation distances, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
<i>Public Protection Comments</i> <i>Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Sustainability Appraisal Conclusion:</b>	-6
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	The site is located outside the development boundary to the east of the settlement but adjoins the currently allocated housing site CLUN002 proposed to be developed in the period 2006 to 2026. The site lies at grade with the surrounding development with hedgerow cover to the road frontage and tree cover on the site and so, is a lower Landscape Sensitive parcel with 'medium' landscape and visual sensitivity. The site is not affected by a known flood risk but a full drainage assessment, ecological assessments and an HRA will be required to protect the River Clun SAC from phosphate discharge, to ensure appropriate conservation, mitigation and enhancement of any habitat or populations of protected and priority species and to retain / enhance the local Environmental Network. The site area is considered sufficient to ensure the scale, density and layout of any potential development can accommodate these requirements but it may be appropriate to retain the policy facility in the current allocation to adjust the eastern boundary in response to the need for a suitable design and layout. Access to the site is directly from the principal highway of the B4368 High Street which provides a pedestrian footway to the site. Vehicular access to the B4368 will require an appropriate visibility splay with the removal of hedgerow and compensatory planting on site. Vehicular access will also require an extension of the 30mph speed restriction to the east of the village. The site must respect the unique setting of Clun as one of only two towns in Shropshire completely enclosed within the Shropshire Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas particularly in relation to highways, ecology and trees.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Allocate for Housing Development</b>
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>CLU005 forms a natural eastern extension to Clun and to the existing housing allocation CLUN002 and would extend the built form of the settlement away from the historic core of the town with its important historic assets. The site lies on the principal highway network into the town and is close to the facilities and services including the adjacent GP surgery and petrol filling station. The development of CLU005, along with CLUN002 will need to take account of the setting of the listed Almhouses lying on the edge of the Clun Conservation Area. The design of the potential development must take account of the unique location of Clun within the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	20 dwellings
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>To satisfy national and local heritage policies through a heritage assessment, delivering good contemporary design with appropriate use of materials, layout, landscaping, open space and incorporating the Public Right of Way through the site. Relevant supporting studies to be undertaken particularly transport assessments, ecology, tree and hedgerow surveys including recognition of Tree Protection Order, flood risk and drainage. Recommendations of the studies to be clearly reflected in the development scheme. This should include a suitable highway access off the B4368 with pedestrian and cycling routes linking to local networks, 30mph speed restriction extended along site frontage and traffic calming measures. Breaching the roadside hedgerow will require compensatory planting. The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water flood risk will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas of the site, which will form part of the Green Infrastructure network. Flood and water management measures must not displace water elsewhere. Development of CLU005 might adversely affect the River Clun Special Area of Conservation and must comply with Policy to satisfy the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Local Plan.</p>

# Community Hub: Worthen and Brockton

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR004</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	3%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	4%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	5%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium and Medium-Low
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High and Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4386 and Brockton Meadow
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Assumes a suitable access junction created to serve this site which is split to the north / south side of A4386. Existing traffic calming / school warning signage on B4386 to be modified. Northern part of site to be linked to Brockton Meadow. Potentially 135 homes.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Assuming pedestrian crossing facilities are provided for those walking from the section of site south of the B4386. Existing footway improvements and new pedestrian crossing by shop would be desirable.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site located adjacent to line of Roman road (HER PRN 00098) and medium size suggested it may otherwise have archaeological potential. Site would largely remove the existing spatial separation between Brockton and Worthen.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The majority of the site is bounded by a mature native hedgerow this is an important habitat corridor and is integral to the character of the area. There are mature trees on the north and eastern boundaries that serve an important role in the character of the area but could have an overbearing influence on properties in a poorly designed development.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>Whilst the site is adjacent to the built form of both Worthen and Brockton, it also forms much of the gap between the two settlements. The retention of this gap and the separate identities of Worthen and Brockton is understood to be a key priority for the two communities.</p> <p>A small proportion of the site is located within the 30, 100 and 1,000 year surface flood risk zone.</p> <p>The northern element of the site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has medium-low landscape and visual sensitivity. The southern element of the site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has a medium landscape and medium-high visual sensitivity.</p> <p>Development of the site could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically provision of pedestrian crossing facilities from the southern element of the site over the B4386. Existing footway improvements and new pedestrian crossing by the shop would also be desirable.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site may have archaeological potential.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	Retain as countryside.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The site forms much of the gap between Worthen and Brockton. The retention of this gap and the separate identities of Worthen and Brockton is understood to be a key priority for the two communities.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. WBR007 and WBR008 is considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; and offer an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the town. WBR010 offers the opportunity to achieve improved pedestrian links between the eastern element of Worthen and the school, village hall and doctors surgery.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	



<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR005</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4386
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	N. Difficult to find safe access point given nature of B4386 in the vicinity of the site. There are no footways. Extended 40 and 30mph speed limits and traffic calming would be essential.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	N. Necessary pedestrian improvements into the village could not be delivered.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. The mature tree will reduce the developable area available. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site located immediately N of an area containing cropmark ring ditches and other features (HER PRN 28714), so may have archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The majority of the site is bounded by a mature native hedgerow this is an important habitat corridor and is integral to the character of the area. There are mature trees within the site that serve an important role in the character of the area which is on sloping ground and highly visible from the AONB. These trees would have an overbearing influence on properties in a poorly designed development. Good design or fully considered compensatory planting should be considered as a constraint in any proposed layout.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>The site is adjacent to the built form of Brockton, however a feeling of separation is caused by the B4386 and the large property curtilage/small field to the east.</p> <p>The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has a medium landscape and medium-high visual sensitivity. The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access. HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC. The site may contain priority habitats. The site may have archaeological potential. Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	Retain as countryside.
<b>Reasoning</b>	The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access. There are preferable sites available within the settlement. WBR007 and WBR008 is considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; and offer an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the town. WBR010 offers the opportunity to achieve improved pedestrian links between the eastern element of Worthen and the school, village hall and doctors surgery.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR006</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	3%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Assumes the site can gain access via an improved field access onto The Hawthorns.
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Assumes a suitable standard estate road and access can be achieved with footways in land controlled by the site.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Assuming the development funds some minor improved for pedestrian crossing at the junction of Croft Close and The Hawthorns.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site includes part of the projected line of the Roman road from Wroxeter to Forden Gaer (HER PRN 00098).
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	Design opportunities should be sought to preserve and address line of Roman road
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	There are mature trees on the boundary of the site these are important to the character and ecology of the area. It is not clear that access to this site could be assured from off The Hawthorns or Oakland Close and the track along the south side of Oakland Close which appears to be the predictable access has a mature hedgerow and trees along its margins which would require consideration in any full application.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of hedgerow lost. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>The sites western portion lies adjacent to the built form of Brockton, however its eastern portion projects into the countryside and as such has a very rural setting. The sites northern boundary is poorly defined. The sites eastern portion also forms part of the gap between the two settlements. The retention of this gap and the separate identities of Worthen and Brockton is understood to be a key priority for the two communities. The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has a medium-high landscape and visual sensitivity. Whilst an access could theoretically be created, there is uncertainty about its achievability.</p> <p>A small proportion of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone.</p> <p>A small proportion of the site is located within 20m of an historic flood event.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site includes part of the projected line of the Roman Road from Wroxeter to Forden Gaer.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	Retain as countryside.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The sites western portion lies adjacent to the built form of Brockton, however its eastern portion projects into the countryside and as such has a very rural setting. The sites northern boundary is poorly defined. The sites eastern portion also forms part of the gap between the two settlements. The retention of this gap and the separate identities of Worthen and Brockton is understood to be a key priority for the two communities. There are preferable sites available within the settlement. WBR007 and WBR008 is considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; and offer an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the town. WBR010 offers the opportunity to achieve improved pedestrian links between the eastern element of Worthen and the school, village hall and doctors surgery.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR007</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	2%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4386
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Subject to a review and extension of existing 30mph speed limit and any necessary traffic calming and provision of footway along site frontage.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N.
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	N. Necessary pedestrian facilities into the village cannot be delivered along B4386. Insufficient highway near two cottages and farm building.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	A PROW crosses the site. Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site located on edge of historic core of village so may have some archaeological potential.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Much of the site boundary is mature native species hedgerow and a line of early mature trees runs the length of the west boundary, these are integral to the character and amenity of the area. The layout and density of the site needs to incorporate these features in a sustainable design that does not result in long term proximity issues.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Farm land and buildings to the west and south including slurry bed to west which will create odour and possible flies.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Significant separation from slurry bed making west of the site unavailable for residential.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>The site is well related to the built form of Worthen, with farm buildings and dwellings to the west and south. Site boundaries are also well defined by hedgerows and the B4386.</p> <p>A small proportion of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone.</p> <p>The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has medium-high landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, however it could be made so through review and extension of the 30mph zone.</p> <p>Furthermore, development of the site could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically provision of pedestrian facilities into the village, however these are not considered achievable along the B4386. They could however be provided through the site and the adjacent WBR008.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site may have archaeological potential.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site.</p> <p>Potential odour and flies associated with slurry bed to the west.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Part 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.



<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	Yes
<b>Recommendation</b>	Allocate for residential development in combination with WBR008.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The site is well related to the built form of Worthen, with farm buildings and dwellings to the west and south. Site boundaries are also well defined by hedgerows and the B4386.</p> <p>Pedestrian facilities into the village from the site to be provided through the adjacent WBR008.</p> <p>The site offers an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the village and introduce traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Whilst the site performs poorly within Part 2a Sustainability Appraisal, this is primarily associated with the sites access to services and facilities. The development offer the opportunity to provide enhanced access to services and facilities and on-site open space provision.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	25 dwellings - across both WBR007 and WBR008.
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>Site design and layout should complement the villages character and setting. Mature trees and hedgerows on the site should be retained.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment should be carried out to determine appropriate measures for improving safe pedestrian and cycle access to local services and amenities. As part of this, an attractive pedestrian route should be provided through the site and the Public Right of Way across the site retained.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be provided from an appropriate location onto the B4386 and appropriate traffic calming measure introduced, including extension of the 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>Bank Farm farmstead and other historic farm buildings should be retained and sensitively converted. A Heritage Assessment should be undertaken, and any appropriate mitigation measures implemented.</p> <p>Any contaminated land on the site should be remediated and buffers provided to adjacent slurry lagoons.</p> <p>The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water flood risk will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas of the site, which will form part of the Green Infrastructure network. Flood and water management measures must not displace water elsewhere.</p>

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR008</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Back Lane
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Assuming the development was limited to 1 or 2 properties as the access to Back Lane is very narrow.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Subject to a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane / B4386 junction with the additional traffic.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	The tree line should be retained and buffered, reducing the developable area available. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m/500m), badgers and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site includes traditional farm buildings associated with historic farmstead of Bank Farm (HER PRN 22086).
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (level 2 historic building assessment of traditional farm buildings).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	Any development should retain and sensitively convert the remaining historic farm buildings if at all possible. Removal of modern portal framed sheds has potential to enhance character of village.
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	There is a line of mature trees on the sites eastern boundary and mature trees on adjacent land to the west, , these are integral to the character and amenity of the area. The layout and density of the site needs to incorporate these features in a sustainable design that does not result in long term proximity issues.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Currently a farm with slurry bed - possible con land.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Con land mitigation likely to be available where necessary.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>The site forms part of the built form of Worthen. Site boundaries are also well defined by the extent of the farm and its curtilage.</p> <p>The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has medium-high landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, whilst this could be achieved via Back Lane, this would only support 1 or 2 properties. However an alternative access could be provided through WBR007.</p> <p>Furthermore, development of the site with an access of Back Lane could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site includes traditional farm buildings associated with Bank Farm.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site which should be retained.</p> <p>There may be contamination on the site.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Part 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	Yes
<b>Recommendation</b>	Allocate for residential development in combination with WBR007.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The site forms part of the built form of Worthen. Site boundaries are also well defined by the extent of the farm and its curtilage.</p> <p>Vehicular access into the site will be provided through the adjacent WBR007.</p> <p>The site offers an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the village and introduce traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Whilst the site performs poorly within Part 2a Sustainability Appraisal, this is primarily associated with the sites access to services and facilities. The development offer the opportunity to provide enhanced access to services and facilities and on-site open space provision.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	25 dwellings - across both WBR007 and WBR008.
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>Site design and layout should complement the villages character and setting. Mature trees and hedgerows on the site should be retained.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment should be carried out to determine appropriate measures for improving safe pedestrian and cycle access to local services and amenities. As part of this, an attractive pedestrian route should be provided through the site and the Public Right of Way across the site retained.</p> <p>Vehicular access will be provided from an appropriate location onto the B4386 and appropriate traffic calming measure introduced, including extension of the 30mph speed limit.</p> <p>Bank Farm farmstead and other historic farm buildings should be retained and sensitively converted. A Heritage Assessment should be undertaken, and any appropriate mitigation measures implemented.</p> <p>Any contaminated land on the site should be remediated and buffers provided to adjacent slurry lagoons.</p> <p>The site will incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage, informed by a sustainable drainage strategy. Any residual surface water flood risk will be managed by excluding development from the affected areas of the site, which will form part of the Green Infrastructure network. Flood and water management measures must not displace water elsewhere.</p>

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR008VAR</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Back Lane (at Bank Farm) and potentially onto B4386.
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Assuming the development is limited to 1 or 2 properties if the access is via Back Lane which is very narrow. Potentially more development if access can be achieved onto B4386.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Subject to a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane / B4386 junction with the additional traffic. If access onto B4386 then limited footway provision to the west (and no scope for improvement) would require non-motorised access to be provided from the site on to Back Lane.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. The tree line should be retained and buffered, reducing the no. of houses possible.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows will need to be buffered.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site includes traditional farm buildings associated with historic farmstead of Bank Farm (HER PRN 22086).
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (level 2 historic building assessment of traditional farm buildings).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	Any development should retain and sensitively convert the remaining historic farm buildings if at all possible. Removal of modern portal framed sheds has potential to enhance character of village.
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	There are mature trees on site and mature potentially important hedgerows form much of the site boundary. Access to the highway is likely to require a large visibility splay and loss of the existing roadside hedgerow. The mature trees offer an important on site screen, but have potential to have an overbearing influence across a significant area of the site. These features are integral to the areas habitat corridors and stepping stones and merit consideration in accordance with the sustainable principles established in CS6 & 17 and MD 2 & 12.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement, Landscape buffers between boundary hedges and existing mature trees which should be incorporated into open space rather than gardens. Where sections of hedge are lost for access this should be compensated for by the establishment of new native hedgerows along the boundary of the visibility splay. The site is prominent in the landscape and requires significant long-term landscape mitigation along the eastern boundary to incorporate the site into the landscape. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining boundary trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Remediation required but likely, amenity issue to neighbouring properties.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>Approximately 2/3 of the site forms part of the built form of Worthen. The remainder consists of agricultural fields beyond the built form of the village. Site boundaries are well defined to south and west consisting of the extent of the farm and its curtilage. However the northern and eastern boundaries are undefined running through agricultural fields. Much of the site overlaps sites WBR008 and parts of WBR007.</p> <p>The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has medium-high landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The site fronts onto Back Lane and the B4386. Access onto Back Lane would only support 1 or 2 properties. Furthermore, access via Back Lane could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction. Access onto the B4386 could support more development. However, where the site has a road frontage with the B4386 could involve a large visibility splay, resulting in loss of the existing roadside hedgerow.</p> <p>There is also limited footway provision along the B4386 to the west of the sites road frontage, the direction of the heart of the village, and no scope for improvement. As such pedestrian and cycle access would have to be provided from Back Lane.</p> <p>An alternative vehicular access onto the B4386 could also be provided through WBR007.</p> <p>A small proportion of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site includes traditional farm buildings associated with Bank Farm.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site which should be retained.</p> <p>There may be contamination on the site.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Part 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	The extent of WBR007 and WBR008 are considered to represent a more appropriate site.
<b>Reasoning</b>	Much of the site overlaps sites WBR008 and parts of WBR007. Together WBR007 and WBR008 are considered to represent a more appropriate site, as they benefit for more clearly defined site boundaries and better opportunities to achieve appropriate pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access.
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR009</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	3%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	5%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Back Lane at two potential locations.
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. But the scale of the development will need to be limited. Back Lane beyond the southern frontage point is not suitable for additional traffic and has not footways and cannot be improved. Potentially 94 homes.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Subject to a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane / B4386 junction with the additional traffic. Likely to indicate only very limited development.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then these areas should not be developed. The mature trees/hedgerows will reduce the developable area available. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles, invertebrates and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, those areas of the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	



<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Possible effect on setting of Grade II listed Barn c.20m S of Bird Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1176317) and the Old Vicarage (NHLE ref. 1055035). Site incorporates the historic farmstead of Bird Farm (HER PRN 22088) and an area of earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 32992).
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, ?level 2 historic building assessment of any historic farm buildings to be demolished; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). NB Historic buildings assessment completed in 2013 in connection with planning app for Bird Farm
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	The site includes three blocks of woodland plantation that serve as asset to the character of the area and would help screen any future development they therefore merit retention.
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	As well as three blocks of woodland (Plantation) there are mature trees and hedgerows on the core area of site and around the margins. These are integral to the character and amenity of the area and would potentially help to screen any new development. The layout and density of the site needs to incorporate these features in a sustainable design that does not result in long term proximity issues.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Possible con land from unknown filled land layer marked on our maps.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Con land mitigation likely to be available where necessary.
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>A very large site that is well related to the built form of Worthen, with dwellings to the east and south. A small proportion of the site is located within the 30, 100 and 1,000 year surface flood risk zone. A small proportion of the site is located within 20m of an historic flood event.</p> <p>The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, whilst this could be achieved, it would limit the amount of development possible as Back Lane has no footways beyond the sites southern boundary and cannot be improved.</p> <p>Furthermore, development of the site could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction. This is likely to support only very limited development.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC. There may be priority habitats on the site.</p> <p>Development of the site may have an effect on the setting of the Grade II listed Bird Farmhouse and Old Vicarage. The site incorporates the historic farmstead of Bird Farm and an areas of earthwork remains of ridge and furrow. The site contains three blocks of valuable woodland. It also contains hedgerow boundaries and other mature trees.</p> <p>There may be contamination on the site.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	Retain as countryside.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, whilst this could be achieved, it would limit the amount of development possible as Back Lane has no footways beyond the sites southern boundary and cannot be improved.</p> <p>Furthermore, development of the site could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction. This is likely to support only very limited development.</p> <p>The site contains three blocks of valuable woodland, hedgerow boundaries, other mature trees, an historic farmstead and earthwork remains of ridge and furrow.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. WBR007 and WBR008 is considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; and offer an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the town. WBR010 offers the opportunity to achieve improved pedestrian links between the eastern element of Worthen and the school, village hall and doctors surgery.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR009VAR</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	1%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-Low
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Back Lane at Chestnut Barn
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. But the scale of the development will need to be limited. Back Lane beyond the southern frontage point is not suitable for additional traffic and has no footways and cannot be improved.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Subject to a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane / B4386 junction with the additional traffic. Likely to indicate only very limited development.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	If priority habitats are present then these areas should not be developed. HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Protection of the mature trees/hedgerows will reduce the no. of houses possible.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The site may contain priority habitats - botanical survey required. Requires botanical survey, EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows will need to be buffered.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	If priority habitat, those areas of the site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Possible effect on setting of Grade II listed Barn c.20m S of Bird Farmhouse (NHLE ref. 1176317) and the Old Vicarage (NHLE ref. 1055035). Site incorporates the historic farmstead of Bird Farm (HER PRN 22088) and an area of earthwork remains of ridge and furrow (HER PRN 32992).
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on settings of LBs, ?level 2 historic building assessment of any historic farm buildings to be demolished; archaeological DBA + field evaluation). NB Historic buildings assessment completed in 2013 in connection with planning app for Bird Farm
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	There is a block of woodland on the south west boundary that will be a constraint on site layout due to shading and proximity. The constraints associated with mature trees and hedgerows on the other boundaries should be given due consideration when density and layout are considered.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	For development at this site to be sustainable the trees on the boundaries will be a constraint on the density of development. Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. The site is prominent in the landscape and requires significant long-term landscape mitigation along the east and south boundaries to incorporate the site into the local landscape. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining boundary trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Fair
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>A large site which is well related to the built form of Worthen, with dwellings to the east and south.</p> <p>A small proportion of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone. A small proportion of the site is located within 20m of an historic flood event.</p> <p>The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, whilst this could be achieved, it would limit the amount of development possible as Back Lane has no footways beyond the sites southern boundary and cannot be improved.</p> <p>Furthermore, development of the site could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction. This is likely to support only very limited development.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC. There may be priority habitats on the site.</p> <p>There is a large block of trees to the south-west of the site and mature trees and hedgerows along site boundaries.</p> <p>Development of the site may have an effect on the setting of the Grade II listed Bird Farmhouse and Old Vicarage. The site incorporates the historic farmstead of Bird Farm and an areas of earthwork remains of ridge and furrow. The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	Retain as countryside.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, whilst this could be achieved, it would limit the amount of development possible as Back Lane has no footways beyond the sites southern boundary and cannot be improved.</p> <p>Furthermore, development of the site could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction. This is likely to support only very limited development.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. WBR007 and WBR008 is considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; and offer an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the town. WBR010 offers the opportunity to achieve improved pedestrian links between the eastern element of Worthen and the school, village hall and doctors surgery.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	

<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR010</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	No
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	B4386
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Subject suitable site access and delivery of traffic calming and new footway along site frontage and crossing facility to access footway on north side of B4386.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers and nesting birds.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	No known archaeological interest on site but medium size suggests it may have some potential.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological DBA + ?field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	N/A
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	The roadside hedgerow is integral to the character of the area as are the trees on adjacent ground to the west. The site has a strong gradient with a Southern facing that means any development at this site would be highly visible from the AONB and the Callow to the south.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Landscape buffers between new development and existing on and off site trees / hedgerows. Compensatory planting for any tree removals or lengths of roadside hedgerow lost to accommodate a visibility splay. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates and compliments existing natural environment features and allows room for sustainable planting of large trees along the boundaries to integrate this prominent site into the landscape.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing mature landscape features and through maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining on and off site field trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	No sig constraints
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Good
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>A linear site which is relatively well related to the built form of Worthen, with dwellings to north and east. However much of the sites southern boundary is poorly defined.</p> <p>The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has medium landscape and medium-high visual sensitivity. The existing highway is not suitable for traffic associated with the development at the point of access, however this could be achieved subject to a suitable site access and delivery of traffic calming measures, a new footway along the site frontage and a crossing facility to access the footway on the north site of the B4386.</p> <p>The site offers an important opportunity to deliver a footway along the B4386, linking the east of Worthen with the school, village hall and doctors surgery and as part of the development.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>The site may have archaeological interest.</p> <p>Hedgerow boundaries and mature trees on the site.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	Yes
<b>Recommendation</b>	Allocate for residential development.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>A linear site which is relatively well related to the built form of Worthen, with dwellings to north and east. Whilst the sites southern boundary is poorly defined, this could be addressed through the development.</p> <p>The site offers an important opportunity to deliver a footway along the B4386, linking the east of Worthen with the school, village hall and doctors surgery and as part of the development.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	20 dwellings
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	<p>An appropriate access will be provided and any necessary traffic calming measures implemented.</p> <p>The site will provide a substantial pedestrian footway along its road frontage and an appropriate crossing of the B4386 linking this footway to that to the north of the road.</p> <p>Mature trees, hedgerows and priority habitats will be retained and appropriately buffered.</p> <p>Strong and significant natural site boundaries will be provided to the east, west and south. This will include sustainable planting of large trees to integrate the site into the landscape.</p> <p>Landscape buffers will be provided between the site and existing development.</p>



<b>Site Assessment - Stage 3</b>	
<b>Site Reference:</b>	<b>WBR011</b>
<i>Coal Authority Reference Area?</i>	No
<i>Mineral Safeguarding Area?</i>	Yes
<i>Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality:</i>	Yes
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:</i>	100%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone:</i>	1%
<i>Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event:</i>	0%
<i>Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network:</i>	0%
<i>All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone:</i>	No
<i>Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS)</i>	Medium-High
<i>Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network?</i>	Y
<i>Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?</i>	Back Lane (at Bank farm) and potentially onto B4386 but visibility will be difficult to achieve without third party land.
<i>Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So?</i>	Y. Assuming the development was limited to 1 or 2 properties as the access to Back Lane is very narrow.
<i>Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works?</i>	N
<i>Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable?</i>	Y. Subject to a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane / B4386 junction with the additional traffic.
<i>Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	HRA will be required for recreational impacts in-combination on The Stiperstones & The Hollies SAC. More than the minimum 30m per bedroom (SAMDev Policy MD2) would be required to address recreation issues in the HRA which could reduce numbers of dwellings possible. See LPR HRA. Protection of the mature trees/hedgerows will reduce the no. of houses possible.
<i>Ecology Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Requires EclA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 250m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Trees and hedgerows will need to be buffered.
<i>Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance hedgerows/tree lines. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
<i>Ecology Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	Site includes substantial historic farmhouse associated with historic farmstead of Bank Farm (HER PRN 22086). Demolition unlikely to be acceptable and redevelopment of the site generally like to have negative impact on settings of surround listed buildings

<i>Heritage Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Site located within historic core of village and may have archaeological interest.
<i>Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	Heritage Assessment required with application (setting assessment for LBs; level 2 historic building assessment of farm house; archaeological desk based assessment and field evaluation).
<i>Heritage Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Tree Comments Other Constraints:</i>	There area a number of significant mature trees on site that play an important role in the character and amenity of the area.
<i>Tree Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	For development at this site to be sustainable the trees will be a constraint on the density of development. Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. The site is prominent in the landscape and requires significant long-term landscape mitigation along the east and south boundaries to incorporate the site into the local landscape. Development density and layout needs to be considered so that it sustainably incorporates existing natural environment features rather than compromising them.
<i>Tree Comments Opportunities:</i>	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through creation of avenues and maintenance of a sustainable buffer with adjoining boundary trees and hedgerows.
<i>Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:</i>	Farm type building to north of site, though there are existing residential in the immediate vicinity.
<i>Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:</i>	
<i>Public Protection Comments Opportunities:</i>	
<b>Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:</b>	Poor
<b>Strategic Considerations:</b>	<p>A small site consisting of a substantial historic farmhouse and its gardens within the historic core of the village. A small proportion of the site is located within the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone.</p> <p>The site is located within a sensitivity parcel which has medium-high landscape and visual sensitivity.</p> <p>The site fronts onto Back Lane and the B4386. Access onto Back Lane would only support 1 or 2 properties. Furthermore, access via Back Lane could not occur without off-site highway works, specifically a review of the safe operation of the Back Lane/B4386 junction. Access onto the B4386 would be subject to ensuring suitable visibility which would be difficult without third party land.</p> <p>HRA will be required for the in-combination recreational impacts on the Stiperstones and The Hollies SAC.</p> <p>There area a number of significant mature trees on site that play an important role in the character and amenity of the area.</p> <p>Site includes substantial historic farmhouse associated with historic farmstead of Bank Farm (HER PRN 22086). Demolition unlikely to be acceptable and redevelopment of the site generally likely to have negative impact on settings of surround listed buildings.</p> <p>Site located within historic core of village and may have archaeological interest.</p> <p>The site contains grades 1/2/3 agricultural land. Applying the precautionary principle this is considered best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The site performs poorly within Part 2a Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
<b>Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.

<b>Known Infrastructure Opportunities:</b>	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
<b>Potential for Windfall?</b>	No
<b>Potential for Allocation?</b>	No
<b>Recommendation</b>	Retain in existing use.
<b>Reasoning</b>	<p>A small site consisting of a substantial historic farmhouse and its gardens within the historic core of the village. Demolition of the farmhouse is unlikely to be acceptable and redevelopment of the site generally likely to have negative impact on settings of surround listed buildings. There area also a number of significant mature trees on site that play an important role in the character and amenity of the area.</p> <p>There are preferable sites available within the settlement. WBR007 and WBR008 is considered to have a better relationship to the built form of the settlement; well defined site boundaries; and offer an opportunity to create an attractive gateway into the town. WBR010 offers the opportunity to achieve improved pedestrian links between the eastern element of Worthen and the school, village hall and doctors surgery.</p>
<b>If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:</b>	
<b>If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:</b>	