Appendix E Broseley Place Plan Area Site Assessments

Published: December 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:

Stage 1: Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal

Additional Sites Identified Through Consultation

Stage 2b: Screening of Sites

Additional Information Gained Through Consultation

Stage 3: Detailed Assessment of Sites

Figure 1: Site Assessment Process

Stage 1: The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)

Stage 1 consisted of a strategic screen and review of sites.

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.

Site Assessment Process

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.

	•
Stage 2a: Sustainability Appraisal	Stage 2a consisted of the assessment of the performance of sites against the objectives identified within the Sustainability Appraisal.
Stage 2b: Screening of Sites	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.
Stage 3: Detailed site review	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. This stage of assessment was an iterative process.

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;
 - o The sites ground conditions;
 - The ability to access the site;
 - o Flood risk to the site or its immediate access;
 - The agricultural land quality of the site;
 - o 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:
 - o The impact on internationally and nationally designated sites and assets;
 - o 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".

- 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:

- o The site is considered unsuitable; and/or
- o The site is considered to be unavailable; and/or
- o 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
- o There is uncertainty about the sites availability; and/or
- o 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
- o 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.

¹ 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).
 - o 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

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

^{**}Significant natural environment/heritage constraints:

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:

- o The value/significance of any identified assets.
- o 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.

Broseley Place Plan Area Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal: Site Assessments

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: BEH001	Site Ref: BEH002	Site Ref: BEH003X	Site Ref: BEH006	Site Ref: BEH007	Site Ref: BEH008	Site Ref: BRO004	Site Ref: BRO006X	Site Ref: BRO007	Site Ref: BRO010	Site Ref: BRO011	Site Ref: BRO012
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that	apply):	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Special Area of Conservation		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ramsar Site National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	0	0
1	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site	140 = 2010 30010 (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
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)		U	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	U	U	0	
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	•	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
2	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0
	250m of a Wildlife Site		0	-	0	-	-	0	0	_	-	0	-	-
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
_		Yes = minus score (-)			_		-		_	-		_		-
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	No = zero score (0)	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app													
	Children's playground	-7/-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Amenity green space	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	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
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all	that apply):												
	Primary School		-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	1	-
	GP surgery		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	+
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	1	-
5	Leisure centre	Yes = plus score (+)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Children's playground	No = minus score (-)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
	Outdoor sports facility		-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Amenity green space		-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)												
6	service offered during peak travel times 4:	No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	Yes = minus score (-)												
7	versatile)	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
_	, i	Yes = minus score (-)		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	All (1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Yes = minus score (-)	_	_		0	_	_	_	_	_	0	0	
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	Cita whall was the writing an Air Ovalite Management Area	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	U	0	U	U	0	0	0	0	0	U	U	1 0 1
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)												0
7.7	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0
40		Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a													
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield	res = double minus score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	140 - 2610 30016 (0)	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0		
	a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply)	r												
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		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	0
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
	300m of a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	-
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for	Double minus score ()												<u> </u>
	residential	Doddio Illinus scole (/												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)												1
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	Zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
	landscape sensitivity for residential	2010 30010 (0)		"	, ,		"	"	"	"				
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or	Plus score (+)												1
	site is inside the development boundary													
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca			_						_		_		
		Overall Score	1	1	1	1	-3	1	-1	-2	-1	-2	-6	-4
	Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Ove	rall Sustainability Conclusion	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Poor	Fair
					·			·	·	·	·	·		

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: BRO014	Site Ref: BRO015	Site Ref: BRO020	Site Ref: BRO021	Site Ref: BRO022	Site Ref: BRO024	Site Ref: BRO026	Site Ref: BRO027	Site Ref: BRO028X	Site Ref: BRO029	Site Ref: BRO030	Site Ref: BRO031
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation	арріу):	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	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	No = zero score (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
	Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)	:												
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation		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
2	500m of a National Nature Reserve 500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	U	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	No = zero score (0)	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	-
	250m of a Wildlife Site		-	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	-
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Yes = minus score (-)	-		-	•	-	-	•	•			•	
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	No = zero score (0)	0	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app													
	Children's playground		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Amenity green space	No = zero score (0)	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
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all t	that apply):												
	Primary School		-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
	GP surgery		-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
5	Library(permanent or mobile library stop) Leisure centre	Yes = plus score (+)	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
3	Children's playground	No = minus score (+)	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Outdoor sports facility	110 = 111111d3 3core (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Amenity green space		-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)		+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)												
6	service offered during peak travel times ⁴ :	No = minus score (-)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	Yes = minus score (-)												
7	versatile)	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Í Ó	Yes = minus score (-)	_		_	_			_	_		_	_	_
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	All an and of the cite is within Floral Zenes O and	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	_	0	0	_	0	0	0	0	0
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	U	0	0
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10		No = zero score (0)	0	0	U	U	0	U	U	U	U	0	U	0
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+
, ,	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	No = zero score (0)	0	Ů	'	'		'	'	'	Ů		Ů	'
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	_	0	0	0	0	0
,,_		No = zero score (0)			, i	, i		, i		Ů			, and the second	
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that ap	оріу):												
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Scheduled Monument a Registered Battlefield	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield a Registered Park or Garden	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	No = zero score (0)		0		0	0		0	0			0	
	a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone or more (record all that apply)) :	<u> </u>	†	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	†	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone	-	-	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	0
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	300m of a Listed Building		-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for	Double minus score ()												
	residential	Doddio Hillias soole ()												4
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)												
1.5														1
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	Zero score (0)		0		0	0	0		0		0		0
	landscape sensitivity for residential	(-/		-										
	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 ca	` ′		+										+
	1. Isaas note. Whore a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca	Overall Score	-7	-2	-2	-2	-1	-3	-3	-1	-3	-4	-4	-3
	Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Over	rall Sustainability Conclusion		Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair	Fair
-	Nango 15 1 to -0 0000 15 1 to -2 1 all 15 -0 to -0 F001 15 -0 to -0 0 VE	an Justamability Joniciusion	1 001	, 300a		_ 500u	_ 500u	l i aii	l an		l an	ı an	l all	ı an

Criteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: BRO032	Site Ref: BRO033	Site Ref: BRO034	Site Ref: BRO035X	Site Ref: BRO036	Site Ref: BRO037	Site Ref: BRO038	Site Ref: BRO039	Site Ref: BRO040	Site Ref: BRO041	Site Ref: BRO042	Site Ref: BRO043
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that	: apply):			0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	
	Special Area of Conservation Ramsar Site	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site	140 = 2010 30010 (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Local Nature Reserve	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply).	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation	<i>).</i> I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of a National Nature Reserve	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Yes = minus score (-)	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	No = zero score (0)	-	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-
	250m of a Wildlife Site	1	_	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	-	0
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Yes = minus score (-)		ŭ	Ů		Ů	-	Ů	ŭ				Ů
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	-
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app													
	Children's playground		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Amenity green space	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)	20.0 000.0 (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all	that apply):	l 	 	_ <u> </u>			<u> </u>						
	Primary School	пас арргуј.	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	GP surgery	1	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-
	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)	1	-	-	-	+	-	+	_		-	-	-	-
5	Leisure centre	Yes = plus score (+)	-	-	_	-	-		_	_	-	-	-	-
	Children's playground	No = minus score (-)	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-
	Outdoor sports facility	TVO = TIIITIUS SCOTC ()	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Amenity green space	1	-	-	_	+	+	+	+	_	+	+	+	+
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)			+	+	-	-	- T	т	+	т	т	-	-
		V	_	Т	т -		_	_	_	т				
6	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	service offered during peak travel times 4:	No = minus score (-)												
7	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	Yes = minus score (-)	_	0	0	0	_	0	0	0	_	_	0	_
,	versatile)	No = zero score (0)		Ů	Ů	· ·		Ů	Ů	Ů			U U	
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	The or part of the site maint a course i retestion 25110 (greathandtor)	No = zero score (0)	, ,	Ŭ	Ů	Ů	, ,	, ,	Ů	Ů	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ů	Ů
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	This of part of the like is within thood 201100 2 of 0	No = zero score (0)	, ,	Ŭ	Ů	Ů	, ,	, ,	Ů	Ů	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ů	
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	٥ .	0	0	0	0
- 10		No = zero score (0)	Ů	Ů	Ů	· ·	Ů	Ů	Ů	Ů	· ·	· ·	U	Ů
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0
11	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	No = zero score (0)	т	V	U	U		т.	т.	U	O	O	т .	U
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12		No = zero score (0)	<u> </u>	0	0	U	0	0	0	0	U	U	U	U
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that a	pply):												
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Scheduled Monument	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield	score ()	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	140 - 2010 30016 (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
	Site boundary within buffer zone 5 of one or more (record all that apply):												
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0
	300m of a Scheduled Monument]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	-	0
	300m of a Listed Building		-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	0
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for	Double minus score ()												<u> </u>
	residential	Double minus score ()			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u></u>		<u> </u>			<u>/</u>
	Cita is subally departly alongified as high landscape and the formation	Minus saars ()												
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)						1						
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	7 (0)				_	_	_	_		_	_		^
	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	Division ()												
	site is inside the development boundary	Plus score (+)			+			1						
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca	ategory is recorded												
-	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Overall Score	-5	-7	-4	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-3	0
	Range is 1 to -8 Good is 1 to -2 Fair is -3 to -5 Poor is -6 to -8 Ove	rall Sustainability Conclusion		Poor	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Fair	Good
	go 10 1 to 0 0 000 10 1 to 2 1 till 10 0 to 0 1 001 10 0 to 0	Judianiability Johiolasion	1	1 001			, 300a	, 5 554		, 3 000			1 411	

riteria	Criteria Description	Scoring Guide	Site Ref: JKD001	Site Ref: JKD002	Site Ref: JKD003	Site Ref: JKD004	Site Ref
	Site wholly or partly within one or more of the following (record all that Special Area of Conservation	apply):	0	0	0	0	0
	Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0
	National Nature Reserve	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0
1					· ·		
	Site of Special Scientific Interest	score ()	0	0	0	0	0
	Ancient Woodland	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	Wildlife Site		0	0	0	0	0
	Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)):					
	1km of a Special Area of Conservation		0	0	0	0	0
	1km of a Ramsar Site		0	0	0	0	0
			0	0	0	0	0
2	500m of a National Nature Reserve	Yes = minus score (-)			<u> </u>		
	500m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest	$No = zero \ score \ (0)$	0	0	0	0	0
	500m of Ancient woodland	20.0 000.0 (0)	-	-	-	-	-
	250m of a Wildlife Site		-	-	0	0	0
	100m of a Local Nature Reserve		0	0	0	0	0
		Yes = minus score (-)	Ů	Ů	, in the second	ŭ	<u> </u>
3	Tree Preservation Order (single or group) within or on site boundary	No = zero score (0)	-	-	-	-	0
	Site contains one or more (or part) of the following 2 (record all that app	()					
	Children's playground		0	0	0	0	0
4	Outdoor sports facility	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0
•					0		
	Amenity green space	No = zero score (0)	0	0	_	0	0
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)		0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within 480m ³ of one or more of the following (record all t	that apply):					
	Primary School		-	-	-	+	+
	GP surgery		_	-	-	-	-
_	Library(permanent or mobile library stop)	Van alexander (1)	-	-	-	-	-
5	Leisure centre	Yes = plus score (+)	-	-	-	-	
	Children's playground	No = minus score (-)	-	-	-	-	-
	Outdoor sports facility		-	-	-	+	+
	Amenity green space		_	-	-	+	+
				-	_	_	-
	Accessible natural green space (natural/semi-natural green space)		-	-	-	-	-
6	Site boundary within 480m ³ of a public transport node with a regular	Yes = plus score (+)		+			
O	service offered during peak travel times 4:	No = minus score (-)	+	_ +	+	+	_
	Site wholly or partly on grade 1 or 2 or 3 agricultural land (best & most	Yes = minus score (-)					
7			0	0	0	0	0
	versatile)	No = zero score (0)					
8	All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone (groundwater)	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0
0	This or part of the one within a course i retection zone (groundwater)	No = zero score (0)	Ŭ	Ů		Ŭ	
•	All (1) 11 17 0 0	Yes = minus score (-)					
9	All or part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 or 3	0	0	0	0	0	
10	Site wholly/partly within an Air Quality Management Area	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0
		No = zero score (0)					
11	Site is wholly/partly classified as brownfield or is wholly/partly within an	Yes = plus score (+)	+	+	+	+	0
, ,	area with a previous industrial or potentially contaminative use	No = zero score (0)	т -		T		"
		Yes = minus score (-)		_		_	
12	Site would displace an existing waste management operation	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (general all that a		 		+		+
	Site wholly/partly within/contains any of the following (record all that ap	υ ρι γ <i>).</i> Ι			_		
	a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone				0		
	a Scheduled Monument	Yes = double minus	0	0	0	0	0
13	a Registered Battlefield		0	0	0	0	0
	a Registered Park or Garden	score ()	0	0	0	0	0
	a Conservation Area	No = zero score (0)			0		
							-
	a Listed Building		0	0	0	0	0
	Site boundary within buffer zone of one or more (record all that apply)):					
	300m of a World Heritage Site or its buffer zone		-	-	-	-	-
	300m of a Scheduled Monument		0	0	0	0	0
11		Voc - minus scare ()					
14	300m of a Registered Battlefield	Yes = minus score (-)	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Registered Park or Garden	No = zero score (0)	0	0	0	0	0
	300m of a Conservation Area		-	-	-	-	-
	300m of a Listed Building		-	0	0	0	0
				Ť	Ť	, in the second	Ť
	Site is wholly/partly classified as very high landscape sensitivity for residential Double minus score ()						
		NE.					
	Site is wholly/partly classified as high landscape sensitivity for residential	Minus score (-)	<u></u>				
15	Site is wholly/partly classified as medium low, medium, or medium high	-					
-	landscape sensitivity for residential	Zero score (0)	I	1	1		1
			 				+
	Site is wholly classified as low landscape sensitivity for residential or	Plus score (+)		+			
	site is inside the development boundary	, ,					
	Please note: where a site falls into more than one category, highest sensitivity ca	tegory is recorded					
							1
		Overall Score	-8	-4	-3	-7	-8

Broseley Place Plan Area Stage 2b Screening of Sites: Site Assessments

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BEH001
Site Address:	Land adjacent to Benthall Villa Farm and Morris Corfield and Co Ltd, Benthall
Settlement:	Benthall near Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.19
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	36
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Part of an agricultural field located between Benthall Villa Farm and Morris Corfield and Co Ltd. To the north west of Benthall.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural. However, there are residential dwellings to the east and south east of the site and the adjacent Morris Corfield and Co Ltd site (west) is a commercial enterprise.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
Availabili	,, <u>,</u> ,1,
Availabili	· ·
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	The site is more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It lies to the west of Benthall, with the built form of Benthall between it and the built form of Bridgnorth.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BEH002
Site Address:	Land south west of Benthall
Settlement:	Benthall near Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	3.59
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	108
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	An agricultural field separated from the built form of Benthall (to the north) by another agricultural field.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is a mix of agricultural and forestry/woodland.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
Availabili	\mathbf{n}^{1} .
Availabili	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	The site is remote from the built form of the settlement being more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It is separated from the built form of Broseley by land that has not been promoted for consideration.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BEH003X
Site Address:	Bethnall Grange
Settlement:	Benthall near Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.14
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	4
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield	N/A
General Description:	A small brownfield site within Benthall.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural, residential and commercial.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informati	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.
Availabi	ity¹:
Conclusion: Size ²	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
Strategic Suitabi	ity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BEH006
Site Address:	Land to east of Longbourne House, Benthall
Settlement:	Benthall near Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.92
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	28
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 35%
General Description:	Part of the site appears to be infrequently used in associated with the Morris Corfield and Co Lit works site on the opposite side of Benthall Lane. The remainder of the site consists of an area of scrubland and a grassed field.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the south is forestry/woodland. Character to the immediate west is forestry/woodland beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the north is a mix of agricultural and commercial. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural and residential.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availabili	.1.
Availabili	y :
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	The site is more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. 19 ³ : It lies to the west of Benthall, with the built form of Benthall between it and the built form of Bridgnorth.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BEH007
Site Address:	South of Benthall Lane, Benthall
Settlement:	Benthall near Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	7.18
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	215
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A large irregularly shaped site located within to the south of Benthall comprising of a series of agricultural fields.
Surrounding Character:	Character to north and north west is predominantly residential. Character to the west is predominantly agricultural. Character to the south is predominantly woodland/forest. Character to the east is a mix of agricultural, woodled areas and dwellings with I
Suitability Information:	Net College
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Assailabilit	1
Availabilit	/ :
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabilit	The site is remote from the built form of the settlement being more closely associated with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It is separated from the built form of Broseley by land that has not been promoted for consideration.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BEH008
Site Address:	Land off Lodge Lane, Benthall
Settlement:	Benthall near Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.29
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	39
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of the northern part of an agricultural field, located to the south of dwellings fronting Benthall Lane.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the south and east is predominantly agricultural. Character to the east is a mix of woodland/forestry and agricultural. Character to the immediate north is residential, beyond which is agricultural.
Suitability Information:	Net Cuiteble
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
Availabil	_{5.} 1.
Availabili	Ly:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	The site is remote from the built form of the settlement being more closely associated ty ³ : with the built form of Benthall than Broseley. It is separated from the built form of Broseley by land that has not been promoted for consideration.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO004
Site Address:	Land between Rough Lane and Pound Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	4.71
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	141
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Site is single parcel as agricultural land currently used as rough grazing, some farm buildings in northern part of site. Scattered mature trees and remnant hedgerows throughout site. Strong boundaries to W with existing residential properties on Forester Rd and Blakeway Close; N with residential properties on Collins Close and Rough Lane; E clearly defined boundary of hedgerows and trees with agricultural field; S with Caughley Rd and further agricultural land. Slight upward slope from N to S. Site is outside but adjacent to development boundary. Land to N between Rough Lane and Coalport Rd pp refused (14/04018/OUT) and appeal dismissed Feb 2016.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural to S and E
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but I utule Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
Availabili	ty¹:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	ty ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO006X
Site Address:	Land east of Bridge Road
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.05
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield	N/A
General Description:	A densely wooded site to the west of Broseley
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural, scrubland and residential.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informat	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.
Availab	lity¹:
Conclusion: Size	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
Strategic Suitab	lity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO007
Site Address:	Land to east of Dark Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.21
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	36
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Site lies to E of Dark Lane outside development boundary and to E and N of main settlement. Is agricultural land currently used for rough grazing or open land - has been farmed more intensively in past. Irregular shaped parcel with ill-defined boundaries comprised mature trees and overgrown hedgerows on all 4 sides. Not directly adjacent to development boundary - separated by Dark lane and residential property (3 Dark Lane). Slight downward slope from NW to SE. Access via track to Dark Lane - no clear direct access to Dark Lane. Site is opposite Dark Lane site with pp for 88 dwells (14/02911/FUL) works commenced.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural land - rough grazing. Boundary with single property (3 Dark Lane).
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but i utule rotellual
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availability	/ ¹ :
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	/ ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO010
Site Address:	Land off Cherrybrook Drive, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.08
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	32
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield	N/A
General Description:	Irregular shaped site adjacent to development boundary. Currently 'scrub' woodland and established trees as extension of tree cover on 'Stocking Mound'. Site lies to E of Cherry Brook Drive to N of existing industrial site off Cockshutt lane (site BRO002) to S of Broseley Cricket Club and existing wooded area known as 'Stocking Mound'. Boundaries are clearly defined with residential properties to W and industrial site to S and E; boundary with woodland to N not clearly defined. Road access only onto Cheery Brook Drive; pedestrian access only via existing network via Cherry Brook Drive.
Surrounding Character:	Residential to W; Industrial to S and E woodland and cricket ground to N.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Sultable but I dtule Fotential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informati	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.
Availabi	lity¹:
Conclusion: Size ²	
Strategic Suitabi	lity ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO011
Site Address:	Land At Cobwell Road, Bridge Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.52
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	16
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Wedge shaped parcel of land outside development boundary but within conservation area. Currently scrub trees with some mature established trees. Bounded by residential development to W on opposite side Bridge Rd and Off Cobwell Rd to E; to N by residential and further woodland. Access either onto Bridge Rd or Cobwell road; pedestrian access via existing links on Bridge Rd, Cobwell Rd or Quarry rd. Site slopes S to N down Bridge Rd. Site has history of past mining and industrial use and is in Coal Authority High Risk area. And is in close proximity to Workhouse Coppice Local Wildlife Site.
Surrounding Character:	Residential - estate development off Cobwell road and single plots on Bridge Rd. Woodland to N running down towards Ironbridge Gorge.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	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.
Availability ¹	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions
	reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO012
Site Address:	Land at Barratt's Hill, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.67
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	20
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Irregular shaped parcel on W edge of settlement outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently agricultural use for rough grazing and informal amenity land with mature trees and established hedgerows. Existing residential properties to N and E further agricultural land to S and W. Obvious boundaries with residential properties to N and E; boundaries with agricultural land less well defined by hedgerows and trees. Road access and frontage onto Barratt's Hill (B4375) pedestrian access via existing pavements on Barratts Hill. Within Conservation Area and in close proximity to Penns Meadow Local Wildlife site.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural land to W and S residential to E and N.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently Sultable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availability	1:
Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO014	
Site Address:	Land off Spout Lane	
Settlement:	Broseley	
Site Size (Ha):	0.35	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	10	
Type of Site:		
If mixed, percentage brownfield	: N/A	
General Description:	Small parcel on W edge of settlement. Currently no discernible use - scrub woodland vegetation with some mature trees on boundaries; no obvious agricultural use maybe some informal amenity use. Outside development boundary but separated by residential properties on Bridge rd. Within conservation area and in close proximity to Work House Meadows and The Mines Local Wildlife Sites and Benthall Edge Wood Ancient Woodland. Boundary to N with Spout Lane and to S and E with residential properties; not clearly defined to W. Road frontage and access onto Spout Lane only; pedestrian access via Spout Lane only no pavements.	
Surrounding Character:	Residential to E and S, unimproved scrubland to W and woodland of Work House Meadows wildlife site to N.	
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential	
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but I dtule Potential	
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown	
Achievability/Viability Informati	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.	
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed	
Availabi	to the next stage of the site assessment process.	
Conclusion: Size ²	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	
Strategic Suitabi	lity ³ :	
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.	

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO015
Site Address:	Land south of Avenue Road
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.83
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	55
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Site comprises part ELR017 - employment land allocation in Broseley. Application 16/02438/REF on adjoining land for mixed residential and employment refused 06/10/2015 then granted on appeal 31/08/2016. Site lies to SE of settlement outside development boundary. Currently in agricultural use with existing farmhouse and farm buildings (The Dunge Farm) on site. Boundaries to W with Avenue Rd; to S, N and E with agricultural land defined by hedgerows and trees and N (part) with properties on Pound lane. Road frontage and access onto Avenue Rd; pedestrian links via existing network on Avenue Rd. Overhead electricity and pylon present on site
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural to S and E residential to N and W.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but I utule Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Not Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed
Availability	to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	³ :
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO020
Site Address:	Land north of Avenue Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.22
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings)) : 7
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfie	ld: Approx. 25%
General Description:	House and large garden site on E edge of settlement within development boundary and conservation area. Several mature trees on site. Boundaries clearly defined with neighbouring residential properties. Road access and frontage onto track off Avenue Rd; pedestrian access via existing links on Avenue Rd.
Surrounding Character:	Established residential area - some large detached dwellings with large gardens, some estate development (Bright Grove). Opposite BRO0015 and site with pp for mixed use development.
Suitability Information:	Comment to Costability
(from SLAA)	Currently Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Informa	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Availa	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed
Conclusion: Size ² :	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).
Strategic Suita	bility ³ :
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO021	
Site Address:	Land at Coneybury Farm, Broseley	
Settlement:	Broseley	
Site Size (Ha):	6.94	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	208	
Type of Site:	Greenfield	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A	
General Description:	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for grazing/fodder crops. Site is bounded by residential estate development to S; Ironbridge Rd and residential properties to W; Coneybury Farm complex and farmland to N and E. Boundaries are clearly defined with residential properties and area mixture of trees hedgerows and fences with neighbouring agricultural land. Some of the boundaries contain mature trees and stretches of established hedgerow. Site has no road frontage or access to current highway network, site is accessed via Coneybury Farm. Promoter claims access from Coalport Close development which appears to be in other private ownership as driveway to 2 properties, nevertheless this access would appear unsuitable for size of site proposed. Pedestrian and cycle access could be via Coalport Close or Ironbridge Rd to existing established network.	
Surrounding Character:	Mixture of agricultural and residential	
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Suitable	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available	
Achievability/Viability Information	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site	
Availability	1.	
Conclusion: Size ² :		
Strategic Suitability	³ : The site appears to be landlocked, without a road frontage.	
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.	

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO022
Site Address:	Land north of Broseley Lodge, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	10.76
Indicative Capacity (Dwelling	s): 323
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfi	eld: N/A
General Description:	Wooded area to the south west of Broseley.
Surrounding Character:	Residential to the north. Wooded to the south. Agricultural to the east and west.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Not Available
Achievability/Viability Inform	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.
Availa	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Siz	ze ² :
Strategic Suita	Approximately 1/3 of the site contains a Local Wildlife Site. The southern element of the site is densely wooded and forms part of a wider woodland corridor. These elements of the site are therefore unsuitable for development. This remainder of the 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).
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO024	
Site Address:	Land off Barratts Hill, Broseley	
Settlement:	Broseley	
Site Size (Ha):	0.19	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	6	
Type of Site:	Mixed	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 25%	
General Description:	Irregular shaped parcel on Western edge of settlement outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently informal amenity land with mature trees. Existing residential properties to N and E further agricultural land to S and W. Obvious boundaries with residential properties to N and E; boundaries with agricultural land less well defined. Road access and frontage onto Barratt's Hill (B4375) pedestrian access via existing pavements on Barratts Hill. Within Conservation Area and in close proximity to Penns Meadow Local Wildlife site.	
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural land to W and S residential to E and N.	
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential	
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but rutule rotelitial	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available	
Achievability/Viability Information	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.	
Availabilit	y¹:	
Conclusion: Size ² :	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).	
Strategic Suitabilit	y ³ :	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.	

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO026
Site Address:	Land off Cockshutt Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	2.31
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	69
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Site on N edge of settlement to N of existing employment area (former WH Dixon site). Site is bounded by B2 use to E; agricultural to N and E; woodland (the 'Stocking Mound') to W and S. Boundaries clear and defensible to W with neighbouring employment use; to N, W and S not readily discernible. Site is currently mixed use with some former industrial land used for storage and/or informal waste management; to N is trees/scrub whilst N portion of site is managed grazing with residential property and garden. Site is outside development boundary and conservation area. No road frontage but site could be accessed through BRO002 or via lane to New House.
Surrounding Character:	Agriculture to N, industry to E and ; woodland to W on reclaimed ground.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but I uture I otential
Availability Information ¹ :	Availability Unknown
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
	As the sites availability for residential development is unknown the site will not proceed
Availability ¹ :	to the next stage of the site assessment process.
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	ry ³ :
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO027
Site Address:	Land at Firey Fields, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.26
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings)	38
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfiel	d: N/A
General Description:	Part superseded by BRO037. Site on outside development boundary on SW edge of settlement currently in agricultural use - rough grazing. Residential estate to E off Bridgnorth Rd; agricultural uses to N, W, and S. Site is adjacent to Fiery Fields Local Wildlife site. Boundaries well defined with neighbouring residential property to E and agriculture and woodland to S and W; not well defined to N. No road frontage, access would have to be via other adjacent sites footpath links through residential estate and via PROW to W and S. Site relatively flat slight upward slope from W to E . High voltage overhead cables across N extremity of site and 33kv wooden posts and cables across centre of site running NW to Se.
Surrounding Character:	Residential estate to E off Bridgnorth Rd; agricultural uses to N, W, and S
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informa	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Availab	ility¹:
Conclusion: Size	
Strategic Suitab	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).
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b		
Site Reference:	BRO028X	
Site Address:	The Pheasant Inn, 56 Church Street	
Settlement:	Broseley	
Site Size (Ha):	0.10	
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5	
Type of Site:	Brownfield	
If mixed, percentage brownfield	: N/A	
General Description:	The Pheasant Inn and its curtilage.	
Surrounding Character:	Residential, commercial and medical.	
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable	
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available	
Achievability/Viability Informati	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.	
Availabi	lity ¹ :	
Conclusion: Size ²	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	
Strategic Suitabi	lity ³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.	
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.	

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO029
Site Address:	Land south west of Mill Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	2.27
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	68
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield	: N/A
General Description:	Site lies on W edge of Broseley outside but directly adjacent in part to the development boundary and conservation area. The site consists of part of an agricultural field and an area with a high concentration of trees. There is a farm building located on the site.
Surrounding Character:	Site to the east recently gained planning permission for 6 dwellings. To the east and north the character is predominantly residential. To the south and west the character is predominantly agricultural and countryside character.
Suitability Information:	N . C
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informati	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.
Augilahi	1:1
Availabi	iity:
Conclusion: Size ²	
Strategic Suitabi	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO030
Site Address:	Land adjacent Woodlands Close, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.66
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	20
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary currently in agricultural use as rough grazing/pasture. Site is bounded by estate development of Woodlands Close to W; Woodlands farmhouse and farmland to S; further farmland to N and E. Boundaries clearly defined with residential properties on Woodlands Close and to S with Woodlands farmhouse but boundaries to E and N appear arbitrary across farmland. Site has no road frontage as such but can be accessed via existing 'hammerhead' on Woodlands Close; pedestrian and cycle access via same access to existing established network.
Surrounding Character:	Agriculture and residential
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availabilit	y¹:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabilit	y ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO031
Site Address:	West of Bridge Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	2.82
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	84
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to Broseley development boundary. Site currently in use for rough grazing and informal recreation. N portion of site previously subject to mineral extraction and now 'unknown filled ground'. Site is bounded by Bridge Rd and Hilltop private property to W; by Floyer Lane and the Bentlands estate development and further agricultural land to E; to N by individual properties; to S by Benthall Lane and individual properties. Boundaries are clearly defined on the ground by a mixture of trees, hedgerows and fencing. Site has road frontage to Bridge Rd, Floyer Lane and Benthall Lane vehicle access currently off Bridge Rd. Cycle and pedestrian access via same routes.
Surrounding Character:	Mixed agricultural and residential
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently Suitable but I uture Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information.	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.
Availability	1:
Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO032
Site Address:	West of Floyer Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	2.36
Indicative Capacity (Dwelling	gs): 71
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownf	ield: N/A
General Description:	Greenfield site outside and removed from Broseley development boundary. Site currently in use for rough grazing and informal recreation. Site is bounded mostly by agricultural land with small boundary with Bentlands estate development on S corner; and top E with Hilltop Cottage and Floyer Hall. Boundaries clearly defined by established hedgerows and mature trees. In N corner of site remains of redundant farm buildings or possible mining related buildings. Site does not have a road frontage or apparent vehicle access - Floyer Lane is unsuitable for vehicles past Floyer Hall.
Surrounding Character:	Mostly agricultural with some residential development
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Currently Available
Availability Information ¹ :	·
Achievability/Viability Inform	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.
Δvail	lability ¹ :
Avaii	ability .
Conclusion: Si	ize ² :
Strategic Suit	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).
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO033
Site Address:	Adj. The Bayliffe's House off Spot Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.28
Indicative Capacity (Dwelling	s): 8
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfi	ield: N/A
General Description:	Small parcel on W edge of settlement. Currently no discernible use - scrub woodland vegetation with some mature trees on boundaries; no obvious agricultural use maybe some informal amenity use. Outside development boundary but separated by residential properties on Spout Lane and Bridge rd. Within conservation area and in close proximity to Work House Meadows and The Mines Local Wildlife Sites and Benthall Edge Wood Ancient Woodland. Boundary to S with Spout Lane residential properties; boundary to W ancient woodland and LWS; to E with access drive to Bayliffe's House. Road frontage and access onto Spout Lane only; pedestrian access via Spout Lane only no pavements. Boundaries clearly defined to E, by LWS and woodland, to S by residential properties to W by access drive but to north appears arbitrary.
Surrounding Character:	Woodland and residential
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but I utule I otential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Inform	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.
Avail	ability ¹ :
	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).
Strategic Suit	ability ³ :
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO034
Site Address:	Adj. Brook Cottage, 4 Bridge Rd, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.21
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings)	6
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfiel	ld: N/A
General Description:	Small greenfield site within development boundary. Currently in use as garden land (so; ancillary residential) of Brook Cottage. Site includes numerous mature trees internally and forming boundaries with adjoining properties. Site is surrounded by residential properties and has road frontage and vehicle access to Bridge St to W.
Surrounding Character:	Gardens and residential properties
Suitability Information:	Currently Suitable
(from SLAA)	
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informa	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.
Availal	pility ¹ :
Conclusion: Size	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).
Strategic Suital	pility ³ :
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO035X
Site Address:	Land off Chapel Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.11
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	<5
Type of Site:	
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	A small site containing woodland and scrubland.
Surrounding Character:	Woodland, scrubland, agricultural land and rural dwellings.
Suitability Information:	Net Coiteble
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availability	¹ :
Conclusion: Size ² :	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).
Strategic Suitability	³ : As the site is less than 0.2ha it has been excluded from the SLAA.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO036
Site Address:	Land off Avenue Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	6.82
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	205
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Large greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Site currently in agricultural use for arable/fodder crops and grazing. Site has road frontage and vehicle access off Avenue Rd on NW boundary of site and to Pound La/Caughley Rd on SW boundary. Pedestrian and cycle access via Avenue Rd or Spout Lane to existing established network. Boundaries of site are clearly defined by mature trees and established hedgerows except on SE boundary which appears to be arbitrary line across existing fields. Site is crossed by 5 set of overhead power lines with at least 2 sets of 400Kv lines.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural and residential. Site is bounded to W and S by agricultural land. To the N planning permission has been granted for a mixed residential and employment development. To the E is an existing residential estate development.
Suitability Information:	Net Comments Contable but Fotoms But and I
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
الناما والمراد	. 1.
Availabili	ty:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	ty ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO037
Site Address:	Land west of Bridgnorth Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.02
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	31
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary on SW edge of town. Current use of site is not clear maybe used for rough grazing and informal recreation. Site is bounded by residential development to N, S and E and further agricultural land to W. Site boundaries are clearly defined by adjacent residential properties to N, S, and E; however W boundary appears to be arbitrary line across field with no discernible definition. Site is bisected by 2 sets overhead power lines 1 of 400kv and also contains many established trees. Site does not have road frontage and vehicle access is via track on N boundary to Bridgnorth Rd pedestrian and cycle access via same.
Surrounding Character:	Residential and agricultural
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informatio	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.
Availabili	ty¹:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitabili	ty ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b		
Site Reference:		BRO038
Site Address:		Adjacent to the Cemetery, Broseley
Settlement:		Broseley
Site Size (Ha):		0.33
Indicative Capacity (Dwellin	igs):	10
Type of Site:		Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brown	field:	N/A
General Description:	fi li d	Greenfield site outside but adjacent to development boundary. Currently in agricultural use for rough grazing. Site is bounded by cemetery to N and W and by residential land and ronbridge Rd to E and Mines Meadow estate development to S. Boundaries are clearly defined on ground by established trees and hedgerows. Road frontage and vehicle access to ronbridge Rd; pedestrian and cycle access via same.
Surrounding Character:	F	Residential, agricultural and cemetery
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)		Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :		Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Infor	mation: S	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.
Ava	ilability ¹ :	
Conclusion:	Size ² : c	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).
Strategic Su	itability ³ :	
Summary:		Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO039
Site Address:	Land east of Dark Lane, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	6.23
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	187
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Large greenfield site to E of Dark Lane opposite Broseley Primary School outside current development boundary. Currently 3 agricultural fields currently used for hay/sileage crops. Access directly onto Dark lane. Site subdivided by existing established managed hedgerow. Boundaries defined to N and S by existing hedgerows, no clear boundaries at all to E; to W boundary with Dark Lane. Site slopes downward from S to N. Site bounded by Dark Lane, Primary School, and residential estate development to W; by residential properties to N and agricultural land to S and E.
Surrounding Character:	Residential and agricultural
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently suitable but ruture rotential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information.	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.
Availability	1.
Conclusion: Size ² : Strategic Suitability	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO040
Site Address:	Coalport Road
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.47
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	44
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Green field outside but adjacent to the development boundary on the eastern edge of the settlement, to the south of Coalport road. Currently used for grazing/pasture. The site falls roughly down to the east, with the eastern boundary delineated by a post and rail fence; N, S and W boundaries comprised 'gappy' hedgerows and scattered mature trees. Site is bounded by further farmland to S and W and residential estate development to E and N. Site has road frontage and onto Coalport road but current vehicle access appears to be from Rough Lane (single track, unpaved access track) to S. Cycle and pedestrian access via Coalport Rd and Rough Lane to existing established network.
Surrounding Character:	Agricultural and residential
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Not currently Sultable but I uture Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availability	1:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	3.
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO041
Site Address:	Land at Coalport Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	3.09
Indicative Capacity (Dwelling	s): 93
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfi	eld: N/A
General Description:	The site consists of two agricultural fields located between Coalport Road and residential properties on Rough Lane.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is predominantly agricultural with a row of dwellings to the north and south of the site.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Inform	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.
Availa	ability ¹ :
Conclusion: Si	ze²:
Strategic Suita	In isolation, the site is separated from the built form of the settlement, but there are other site promotions within this area of separation (and the other site is considered available, of an appropriate site and the strategic assessment has not identified a significant constraint).
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO042
Site Address:	Land west of Monewood House, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.68
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	20
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of an area of scrubland/woodland located to the east of Broseley. Site boundaries are defined by Ironbridge Road to the west, woodland to the north and south and is relatively undefined to the east.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the west and north is a mix of woodland and large rural dwellings on large plots. Character to the south is predominantly woodland. Character to the east is a mix of woodland and scrubland.
Suitability Information:	NI/A
(from SLAA)	N/A
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informati	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.
Availabi	ity¹:
Conclusion: Size ²	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).
Strategic Suitabi	ity ³ : The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	BRO043
Site Address:	Land at Coalport Road, Broseley
Settlement:	Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.47
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	44
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield.	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of two agricultural fields located between Coalport Road and residential properties on Rough Lane. Site boundaries are defined by Coalport Road to the north, residential curtilages to the south and west and a brook to the east.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the north and south is a residential beyond which it is agricultural. Character to the east is predominantly agricultural.
Suitability Information:	NI/A
(from SLAA)	N/A
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availabil	ity¹:
Conclusion: Size ²	
Strategic Suitabil	ity ³ : The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	JKD001
Site Address:	Land to north of The Woodlands, Jackfield, Broseley
Settlement:	Jackfield, Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.64
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	19
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	Densely wooded site located to the north east of Jackfield near to the Jackfield Tile Museum.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is a mix of residential, to north west and south and agricultural/woodland and a leisure to the west.
Suitability Information:	Not Suitable
(from SLAA)	Not Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	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.
Availability	:
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	: The site is densely wooded, and these trees are subject to a group TPO protection.
Summary:	Removed from the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	JKD002
Site Address:	Land off Calcutts Road, Jackfield, Broseley
Settlement:	Jackfield, Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	0.39
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	12
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield	: Approx. 15%
General Description:	The site consists of a single residential dwelling and its extensive curtilage.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is a mix of commercial and residential.
Suitability Information: (from SLAA)	Currently Suitable
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Informat	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Availab	lity¹:
Conclusion: Size	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).
Strategic Suitabi	lity ³ :
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	JKD003
Site Address:	The Rock Metal Works, Calcutts Road, Jackfield, Broseley
Settlement:	Jackfield, Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.43
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	43
Type of Site:	Mixed
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	Approx. 75%
General Description:	The site consists of the Rock Metal Works Site (a protected employment site) and its associated landscaping.
Surrounding Character:	Surrounding character is a mix of commercial, residential, agricultural and woodland.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Detential
(from SLAA)	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information:	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.
Availability	ı,
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	JKD004
Site Address:	Land off Ironbridge Road, Jackfield, Broseley
Settlement:	Jackfield, Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	1.69
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	51
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of an agricultural field located to the east of Broseley.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the north is a mix of residential and agricultural. Character to the east and south is predominantly agricultural.
Suitability Information:	Not Currently Suitable but Future Potential
(from SLAA)	Currently Available
Availability Information ¹ :	Residential development is generally considered achievable and viable unless there are site
Achievability/Viability Information:	specific issues evident. To confirm this conclusion, a viability assessment will be undertaken to inform the Local Plan Review.
Availability ¹ :	
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability ³ : Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions
Julilliai y.	reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Site Assessment - Stage 2b	
Site Reference:	JKD004VAR
Site Address:	Land off Ironbridge Road, Jackfield, Broseley
Settlement:	Jackfield, Broseley
Site Size (Ha):	5.10
Indicative Capacity (Dwellings):	153
Type of Site:	Greenfield
If mixed, percentage brownfield:	N/A
General Description:	The site consists of an agricultural/wooded areas located to the east of Broseley.
Surrounding Character:	Character to the west is predominantly residential. Character to the north is a mix of residential and agricultural. Character to the east and south is predominantly agricultural.
Suitability Information:	N/A
(from SLAA)	N/A
Availability Information ¹ :	Currently Available
Achievability/Viability Information	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.
Availability	¹ :
Conclusion: Size ² :	
Strategic Suitability	³ : The site was promoted following the conclusion of the SLAA.
Summary:	Considered within the next stage of the site assessment process due to conclusions reached regarding the sites availability, size and/or suitability.

^{1, 2 and 3} Further information provided within the Site Assessment Process Overview.

Broseley Place Plan Area Stage 3 Detailed Site Review: Site Assessments

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO004
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	V
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:	2%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	5%
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-Low and Medium-High
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	·
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Via Rough La / Collins Cl
Reasonably be Made So?	Via Roagii Ea / Comiis Ci
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	'
VVOINS:	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Assumes vehicular access would not be via Pound La.
Site Works Achievable?	7.554THES VEHICUIAL ACCESS WOULD HOUSE VIA FOUND LA.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	
Convenience Store & Public Transport	21
Service):	
23. 7.007.	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
	EcIA required. Bat potential in mature trees and also notable species recorded nearby that are likely to forage
Ecology Comments	over this area given 'wide' character. Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor. Northern
Other Constraints:	portion is within Environmental Network and also identified as potentially priority habitat which would require
	survey between May and end of August.
Early Company	Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows on boundaries. Retain mature
Ecology Comments	trees in field. Enhance and restore Env. Network to north and west in accordance with CS17 Environmental
Management of Constraints:	Networks and MD12. Extend the network to the south along the east boundary
	3

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Enhancement of the network to the east and south. Also greenspace provision should be accessible to existing housing to the west who currently don't have much Accessible Natural Greenspace. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	HER indicates that eastern side of site previously formed part of the Dunge Colliery and associated coal workings (HER PRN 07285). N part of the site also formed part of the Broseley Tileries (HER PRN 04631) and is crossed by the former course of an early tramway (HER PRN 07287). Site therefore holds archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation).
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	hedgerows and trees to site boundary and trees and scrub internal to northern end of site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Contaminated land possible due to past mining operations and historic railway line crossing the site.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation possible.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO007
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	No
Agricultural Land Quality:	INO
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
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:	6%
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	227
detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source	Ma
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	Madium
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-High
(from the LVSS)	ivieuluIII-TigII
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	'
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Using current field access / Bridleway
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	N.
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Y. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto Dark
Reasonably be Made So?	Lane without acquiring third party land.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	· ·
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	23
Convenience Store & Public Transport	25
Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	None
organificant constraints.	
	EclA required. Greecland has been identified as notantially of LIK Brighty states. However, Local Wildlife City to
Ecology Comments	EcIA required. Grassland has been identified as potentially of UK Priority status. Haycop Local Wildlife Site is adjacent and has significant fungi species and also Dingy Skipper (UK Priority Species). Both of which could also
Other Constraints:	be found on this site.
	De Iouliu off tills site.
Ecology Comments	Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows on boundaries. Enhance and
Management of Constraints:	restore Env. Network surrounding most of site in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.
	Extend the network to the south along the east boundary

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Suggest green/brown roofs as habitat for priority butterflies and moths and to reduce surface water run-off. Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Use 'green hay' technique for seeding any grassland - ideally using hay from nearby Enhance woodland edge as part of open space requirement and buffer woodland and scrub with most enhancements being to the north east adjacent to the Wildlife Site. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located adjacent to former Clench Acre Mine (HER PRN 32987), so has some archaeological potential.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + ?evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	site surrounded by trees and continuous with wider network of woodland.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	None
Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	Possible land contamination.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation available.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO010
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	N ₀
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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	F0/
surface flood risk zone:	5%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	19%
surface flood risk zone:	19%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	34%
surface flood risk zone:	34%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	070
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	070
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	24%
detailed river network:	Z7/0
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	NO .
Landscape Considerations:	Very High
(from the LVSS)	very riigh
Visual Impact Considerations:	High
(from the LVSS)	111811
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	·
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Via Cherrybrook Drive
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
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	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Bating (Out Of 24)	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	
Convenience Store & Public Transport	21
Service):	
Sc. vicej.	
Ecology Comments	Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in
Significant Constraints:	open space provision.
Ecology Comments	Much of site appears to be woodland, scrub or potential priority open habitat of some kind. Two ponds are
Other Constraints:	present nearby. Environmental Network covers much of site.
Ecology Comments	Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space
Management of Constraints:	provision. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Very likely to have reptiles on site in the open areas
management of constraints.	near paths. Buffers would be needed to the pond and the woodland areas leaving very little for development

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements in woodland and open habitat. Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Western side of site contains former mine workings (HER PRN 32861) and therefore hold archaeological interest
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	site is covered in trees and scrub and connects to adjoining and wider woodland network.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	Possible land contamination. Possible noise etc from factories to the south.
Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation available. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Size Reference: 880011 Cool Authority Reference Area? Yes Mineral Sofeguanding Area? Yes Agricultural Land Quarity: 8 Percentage of size in Mode 2 and 3: 0% Percentage of size in Mode 2 and 3: 0% Percentage of size in Mode 2 and 3: 100% Percentage of the size in Mode 2 and 1: 100% Percentage of the size in Mode 2 and 1: 100% Percentage of the size in Mode 2 and 1: 100% Percentage of the size in Mode 2 and 1: 100% Percentage of the size in the 100 year Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size in the 1,000 year Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size in the 1,000 year Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size in the 1,000 year Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size in the 1,000 year Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size institute of the Pload Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size in the 1,000 year Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size institute of the Pload Surface Pload risk some: Percentage of the size within 20 and of a destandard risk some of the size in the 1,000 year After your of the size within 20 and of a destandard risk sourface Pload ris	Site Assessment - Stage 3	
More of Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Growth 2, 3 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Guality: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 3D year Lufface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: No No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No No High Highway Comments - United fload zone: Highway Comments - View of the site with the Development Coccur Victiona Clf-site Highway Comments - Could the Development Stantish Hollowy Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Oxidi the Development Coccur Victiona Clf-site Works Stantis - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Oxi	Site Reference:	BRO011
More of Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Growth 2, 3 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Guality: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of Site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 3D year Lufface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: No No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year Surface fload risk zone: No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No No All Stantis fload risk zone: No No High Highway Comments - United fload zone: Highway Comments - View of the site with the Development Coccur Victiona Clf-site Highway Comments - Could the Development Stantish Hollowy Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Oxidi the Development Coccur Victiona Clf-site Works Stantis - Are Envisaged Off- Ste Works Achieved? Highway Comments - Oxi	Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood 2 ane 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 2 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood site 3 ane: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Agricultural cond. Gladity: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 200 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 200 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 200 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 200 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site with 200 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an institute flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an institute flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed risk within 20m of a detai	Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	N ₁ -
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 20 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year surface Flood risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface Flood risk zone: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of the site in the 2,000 year detailed river network: No Percentage of t	Agricultural Land Quality:	NO
Percentage of site in Flood Jane 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood vent. Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood vent. Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (Iron the LVSS) Very High Very High Very High Ward Naments - Site Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fusiting Highway Highway Comments - Fusiting Highway ot Access Point is Nat Suitable, Can It Resonably be Achieved? Highway Comments - General Highway ot Access Point is Nat Suitable, Can It Resonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Caud the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Source Bruisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Ecology Comments Control Cont	Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Jane 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood vent. Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood vent. Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (Iron the LVSS) Very High Very High Very High Ward Naments - Site Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fusiting Highway Highway Comments - Fusiting Highway ot Access Point is Nat Suitable, Can It Resonably be Achieved? Highway Comments - General Highway ot Access Point is Nat Suitable, Can It Resonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Caud the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Source Bruisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Ecology Comments Control Cont		0%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood way: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detoiled river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Indians considerations: Indians considerations c		100%
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Londscape Considerations: (from the USS) High High High High High High High High West Ownments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point Highway Comments - Existing Highway of Access Point is No Stutable, Con It Reasonably be Mode So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible Open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with Caroly Tevitoremental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with Caroly Tevitoremental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with Caroly Tevitorement and the control of the North Acces and the Source Protect enhance and restore E		
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface fload risk zene: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface fload risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic fload event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Londscape Considerations: (From the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (From the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: High Highway Comments - If No Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably & Achieved? And Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Con One Reasonably & Achieved? And Highway Comments - Six Sixting Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Con it Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Ould the Development Occur Without Off- Site Works? Highway Comments - Ould the Overlapment Source of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be js an area Tiree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restor Fersevation Order. Protect enhance and restor Fers		0%
Surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Historic Flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Londscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Ifform the LVSS) Ifform the LVSS) High High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point: Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made 50? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible Open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environments Ecology Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision.		
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) No High High High High Way Comments - If No Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reosonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - If Not Sixtoble for Infigure Comments - If Not Sixtoble, Can It Reasonably be Mode 50? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Access Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tire Prevervation Order. Protection and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tire Prevervation Order. Protection and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tire Prevervation Order. Protection of the Constraints:		0%
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: No Protection Zone: Very High Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSs) High the LVSs) High was proments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access, Can One Reasonably be Achieved? And How? Highway Demonents - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Fixing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway of Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with 6327 Environmental Networks and the rest (which arguably should also be) an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with 6327 Environmental Networks and the rest (which arguably should also be) an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with 6327 Environmental Networks and the rest (which arguably should also be) an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with 6327 Environmental Networks and the rest (which arguably	Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network network network network network network network and his part of the site is currently in the Environments Other Constraints: Display Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and MD12. Protected Other Constraints:		0%
Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network network network network network network network and his part of the site is currently in the Environments Other Constraints: Display Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and MD12. Protected Other Constraints:	Percentage of the site identified on the EA	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (Mrom the LVS) Visual Impact Considerations: High High High High High High High Work Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: High High High High High High High High		0%
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detoiled river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSs) Very High Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSs) High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Pierct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Fix String Highway Suitable for Troffic Associated with the Development of the Access Point? Highway Comments - Fix String Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made 50? Highway Comments - Get String Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made 50? Highway Comments - Fix String Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made 50? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected Other Constraints:	·	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: No part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indianguage Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to 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? Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point? Highway Comments - Russing Highway ot Access Point in Source Source In		0%
detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected other Constraints: Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected other Constraints:		
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Ury High Very High Very High Very High Very High Very High Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - Fils 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? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected other Constraints:		0%
Industrial Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High High (from the LVSS) High Way Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Evironmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High High High High High Works Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Ji 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? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Given scale of development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Protect of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Protect of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Protect of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Protect of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Protect of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Protect of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tre		No
Very High Visual Impact Considerations: High		
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected Other Constraints:	·	Very High
Ifrom the LVSS 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? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Gould the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Y Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Wighway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments		
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably Be Made So? Highway Comments - Guild the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		High
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? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protec enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
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? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect on the Constraints:		Υ
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Soutable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Saccessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Cossibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Coology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	•	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		•
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	·	
Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		Given scale of development
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		diversiscale of development
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	,	
Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		V
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		1
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	VVOIKS!	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	Site Works Achievable?	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	Highways Accessibility Pating (Out Of 24)	
Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protect enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected other Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision.		14
Cology Comments Significant Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected other Constraints: Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible open space provision.	•	
Significant Constraints: Open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	Sc. vicej.	
Significant Constraints: Open space provision. Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	Ecology Comments	Only reduced numbers of housing possible as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in
Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	S.g.nj.cant constraints.	open space provision.
Ecology Comments Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Ecology Comments Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		
Ecology Comments Environmental Network and the rest (which arguably should also be) is an area Tree Preservation Order. Protected enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected		Much of site appears to be woodland / scrub and potentially priority habitat. Half the site is currently in the
Other Constraints: enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Protected	Ecology Comments	
	<u>.</u> ,	
The state of the s		
Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space		Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space
Provision Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Buffers would be needed to the nond and the		
Management of Constraints: woodland areas leaving very little for development	Management of Constraints:	
woodiand areas leaving very little for development		woodiand dreas leaving very little for development

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements in woodland and open habitat. Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within Broseley Conservation Area and setting of the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site. Former coal workings (HER PRN 31083) and a tramway (HER PRN 31082) present on site, so hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of WHS). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	site is covered in coppice and other woodland, part of which is subject to a TPO. It connects to the woodland of Ironbridge Gorge
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	Possible land contamination.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation available but mining shaft on site which could cause stability issues etc (outside my remit but worth noting).
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Reference: Coal Authority Reference Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood wisk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood went: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Wedium-Low W
Mineral Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 3: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 2: Percentage of site in Fload Zone 1: Percentage of the site in Hour Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the inte 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Wedium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: Percentage of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wedium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
(from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
(from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
(from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How?
How?
How?
Highway Comments - Existing Highway
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the
Development at the Access Point?
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development
Reasonably be Made So?
Highway Comments - Could the
Development Occur Without Off-Site Y
Works?
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-
Site Works Achievable?
Site Works Adillevable:
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,
Convenience Store & Public Transport
Service):
Ecology Comments None
Significant Constraints:
Ecology Comments Ecology Comm
Ecology Comments Trees and hodges in landscaping as part of corridor, any open space to be adjacent to and enhance Env. Netw.
Other Constraints: trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corridor, any open space to be adjacent to and enhance Env. Netw
Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely
Management of Constraints: be fully possible in open space provision

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Use 'green hay' technique for seeding any grassland - ideally using hay from the nearby. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within Broseley Conservation Area and may fall within the settings of a number of the Grade II listed buildings in the vicinity. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval coal workings may be present across much the site (HER PRNs 04565 &0728), so site may hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment; impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of LBs). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	numerous trees spread across most of site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	Noise from road to the north of the site.
Other Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Fair
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Cool Authority Reference Area? Wes Wholly or Pathly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximation Including Area? Wes Wholly or Pathly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximation Including 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximation Including 1, 2 and/or 3 Approximation Including 2, 2 and/or 3 Approximation Including 3, 2 and/or 3 Approximation Including 4, 2 and/or 3	Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Moneral Significant (and Guality: Money or Port of Gual 2, 2 and for 3 Agricultural Land Guality: Mercentoge of six en Plada Zone 3: Mercentoge of the six en Inte 30 years Junifice Flada Kins xone: Mercentoge of the six en Inte 30 years Junifice Flada Kins xone: Mercentoge of the six en Inte 30 years Junifice Flada Kins xone: Mercentoge of the six en Inte 100 years Junifice Flada Kins xone: Mercentoge of the six en Inte 100 years Junifice Flada Kins xone: Mercentoge of the six en Inte 100 years Junifice Flada Kins. Mercentoge of the six en International States Medium I	Site Reference:	BRO024
Wholly or Partly Scrade 1, 2 and/or 3 Application to and Quality: Percentage of six in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of six in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 400 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six in the 400 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the six one: Percentage of the si	Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Scrade J. 2 and/or 3 Application of an Guardies Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of the site in the 40 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 40 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 400 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 400 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 400 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood word: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site site of the site within 10m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 10m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site within 20m of a detailed rive network: All op part of the site site site site site site site sit	Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Applicational and Quality: Percentage of site in Flood 2 note 2: Percentage of site in Flood 2 note 2: Percentage of site in Flood 2 note 1: 100% Percentage of site in Flood 2 note 1: 100% Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood in site of the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood in site of the 1,000 year surface flood in site one: Percentage of the site within 2 non of a flood flood in site of the 1,000 year surface flood in site of 1,000 year surface flood year surface flood in site of 1,000 year surface flood year year year year year year year year	Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	NI-
Percentage of site in Flood 2 and 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 years and see the percentage of the site in the 30 years and see the percentage of the site in the 30 years and see the percentage of the site in the 30 years and see the percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood site was not 200 years and see the percentage of the site in the 1,000 years and see the percentage of the site in the 1,000 years and see the percentage of the site in the 1,000 years and see the percentage of the site in the 1,000 years and see the percentage of the site within 20 and on the EA instance flood that 20 and on the site of the site within 20 and on the site of the	Agricultural Land Quality:	INO
Percentage of site in Flood 2 and site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 300 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic flood when: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic flood when: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: No Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: No Protection 2 one: No Protection 2 one: Medium Low Inform the LVS3 Information and LVS3 In	Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood 2 and site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 300 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic flood when: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic flood when: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: No Protection 2 one: All or part of the site within 5 source Protection 2 one: No Protection 2 one: No Protection 2 one: Medium Low Inform the LVS3 Information and LVS3 In		0%
surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the ster in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the ster in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the ster in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the ster in the 1,000 year surface (flood risk sone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a decided risk enter within 20m of a decided risk enter within 20m of a decided risk enter within 3 Source Protection Zone: No No Redulant-Low (flood the considerations: Indication (flood event: No Protection Zone: No Redulant-Low (floom the USS) Wisual impact Considerations: Medium-Low Ingihavo (somments - Direct Access to Highway (somments - Protection Zone: Highway (somments - Protection Zone: Highway (somments - Protection Zone: Highway (somments - Fisting Highway solitable) for Traffic Associated with the No Development at the Access Point is No Stratable. Cost at Reasonably be Made So? Highway (somments - Could the Development Caces Without Off Site Works Achievothe? Highway (somments - Could the Development Caces Without Off Site Works Achievothe? Highway (somments - Stratage (off Site Works Achievothe? Highway (somments - Could the Development Caces Without Off Site Works Achievothe? Highway (somments - Stratage (off Site Works Achievothe? Highway (somments - Works Achievothe? Hig	Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	100%
Surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of on historic flood west: No All or part of the site within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Inadkcape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Visual impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Fivet Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Care One Reasonably the Achieved And 16027 Highway Comments - Guite the Access don'the Development of the Access Point is Not Sirobio Le on the Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made 50? Y. Suitability of access will need to be checked by the small scale of development and hedges in landscaping as part of	Percentage of the site in the 30 year	00/
Surface (Bood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface (Bood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Percentage of the site within 20m of an O% Percentage of the site within 20m of an O% Percentage of the site within 20m of an O% All or part of the site within 20m of an O% All or part of the site within 20m of an O% Percentage of the site within 20m of an O% All or part of the site within 20m of an O% All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indiscape Considerations: (From the LVSS) (From the LV	surface flood risk zone:	U%
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood way: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection of the site within a Source Protection 20ne: Protection 20ne: Protection 20ne: Indiscape Considerations: Indiscape Considerations: Medium Wissual import Considerations: Indigenate VCSS) Wissual import Considerations: Indigenate VCSS) Wissual import Considerations: Indigenate VCSS) Wissual import Considerations: Indigenate VCSS Indige	Percentage of the site in the 100 year	00/
surface flood risk cone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood wap: Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood event. Percentage of the site within 20m of an Aistoric flood event. Percentage Considerations: Indicage Con	surface flood risk zone:	0%
Surgice pool risk zone: Percentage of the size identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the size within 20m of on historic flood event: Percentage of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size size within 20m of o detailed river network: All or part of the size size size size size size size siz	Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	1%
Historic Flood Mop: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a decided river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Londscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Needium Medium-Low Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Pivect Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - Fix No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point? Is Not Suitable, for Telfic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Guid the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: EciA required. All the site is within the Environmental Network. Bat potential in mature trees. Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August.	surface flood risk zone:	1/0
Instance hood Magi: Precentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Precentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All for part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All for part of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: No Indiscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-Low (from the LVSS) No Direct Access to Highway Comments - Proceedings and the Access Point? Highway Comments - Suitable, Can It Access Access Proceedings and the Access Point? Highway Comments - One Emissage Offsel of the Comments - Proceedings and the Access Point? Highway Comments - Are Emissaged Offsel of the Comments - Proceedings and the Comm	Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within Source Protection Zone: Condiscope Considerations: (from the LVSS) (from the LVSS) (from the LVSS) (Fighiany Comments - Direct Access to Highway Forming Source Protection Zone: (Fighiany Comments - Fi No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? (Fighiany Comments - Fixing Highway Suitable for Triffe Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Fixing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - Quitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? (Fighway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Ecology Comments Cology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August.	Historic Flood Map:	070
Instance (Dod event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVS3) (From	Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
detailed river networks. All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indiscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) (historic flood event:	5 /0
All or port of the sits within a Source Protection Zone: (from the LVSS) Medium Medium-Low (from the LVSS) No Direct Access to Y Mighway Comments - Direct Access, Can One Resonably Be Achieved? And How? Medium-Low Medium-Low (from the LVSS) No Direct Access No Direct Access (from the LVSS) Medium Y Medium-Low (from the LVSS) No Direct Access (from the LVS) No Direct Access (from the L	Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: [from the LVSS] (from the LVSS] Medium-Low	detailed river network:	3 /8
Industry Considerations: Ifform the LVSS Medium		No
Medium M	Protection Zone:	
Wedium-Low Wed	•	Medium
Ifform the LVSS Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Triffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Y Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of development Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works? Y Suitability Rating (Out Of 24) Reasonably Rating (Out Of 24) Rea		
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can it Reasonably be Mode 5:0? Highway Comments - General Highway of Access Point is Not Suitable, Can it Reasonably be Mode 5:0? Highway Comments - General Highway of Access Point is Not Suitable, Can it Reasonably be Mode 5:0? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	•	Medium-Low
Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can it Reasonably be Made 5:0? Highway Comments - Guid the Development of Cour Without Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
Highway Network? Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Nobevelopment at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Fi sisting Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		Υ
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary Shool, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	<u> </u>	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Sultable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of Mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention of Mature trees unlikely to the School of Environmental Network and retention		
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Acces	•	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
Development at the Access Point? 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? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		A.I
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? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	* **	IN .
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	·	
Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		V. Suitability of access will need to be checked by probably OK given small scale of dovolonment
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highway Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	· ·	1. Suitability of access will fleed to be checked by probably on given sitial scale of development
Development Occur Without Off-Site Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	,	
Works? Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		v
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None EclA required. All the site is within the Environmental Network. Bat potential in mature trees. Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		'
Site Works Achievable? Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Site Works Achievable?	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Highways Accessibility Ratina (Out Of 24)	
Convenience Store & Public Transport Service): Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: None Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		18
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Service):	
Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments Other Constraints: Ecology Comments All the site is within the Environmental Network. Bat potential in mature trees. Retain mature trees and hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Ecology Comments	None
And hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Significant Constraints:	Notice
And hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
And hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
And hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to		
And hedges in landscaping as part of corrido. The grassland shows promise so would require survey between May and end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	5 / 0	EcIA required. All the site is within the Environmental Network. Bat potential in mature trees. Retain mature trees
And end of August. Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Ecology Comments	·
Ecology Comments Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to	Otner Constraints:	
		ŭ .
	Ecology Comments	Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network and retention of mature trees unlikely to
	Management of Constraints:	·

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Avoid topsoil on open space where possible. Use 'green hay' technique for seeding any grassland - ideally using hay from the nearby. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within Broseley Conservation Area and may fall within the settings of a number of the Grade II listed buildings in the vicinity. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval coal workings may be present across much the site (HER PRNs 04565 &0728), so site may hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment; impact on character and appearance of CA and settings of LBs). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	relatively small site with numerous trees
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments	None
Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	None
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	None required.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	F
Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO027
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	No
Agricultural Land Quality:	NO
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	2%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	4%
surface flood risk zone: 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:	N do alicens
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-Low
(from the LVSS)	Wiedlufff-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	•
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Assumed via Bridgnorth Road.
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	V
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	Υ
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	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport	22
Service):	
55. 1166/1	
Ecology Comments	No
Significant Constraints:	None
Ecology Comments	Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat between two core areas and the habitat is listed as
Other Constraints:	nearly priority habitat. But it might be better. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and
Chief Constituints.	could support bats.
Early Company	
Ecology Comments	Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in next door Local Wildlife Site would need survey for
Management of Constraints:	potential as a breeding site for Great Crested Newts.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Ensure hedgehog friendly development that includes gaps in fence gravel boards, etc. Plan areas of open space that compliment the priority habitats to the west and south. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of early post-medieval coal workings (bell pits) are present across the site (HER PRN 04565), so site hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation).
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	site bordered by hedgerows and trees and connects to large block of woodland to the south
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Development stand-off to woodland to the south
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to connect to and extend woodland cover to the south.
Public Protection Comments	none
Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	Possible mine shaft on site noted for your information.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO029
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	N ₂
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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	00/
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	0%
surface flood risk zone:	070
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	070
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	070
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	•
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-Low
(from the LVSS)	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	''
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	N. Chapel Lane is unsuitable for the additional traffic that is likely to be generated by the development which may
Reasonably be Made So?	potential involve 90 homes.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	N
Works?	
Highway Comments And Environment Off	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	N. The Chapel Lane / B4375 junction would need to be improved and third party land would be needed.
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	19
Convenience Store & Public Transport	±3
Service):	
Foology Comments	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	
Ecology Comments	EclA required. Surveys for habitats, GCN (in pond 80m to west), Dormice (known records in general area),
Other Constraints:	Badgers (known), Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles Some Environmental Network crosses site and,
	with more survey, additional core / priority habitat or corridor could be identified.
	Protected energies mitigation and enhancement. Potain and enhance all hadge-rave (tree lines on have desire
Ecology Comments	Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to south and east in accordance with
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network
management of constraints.	unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision.
	annikely to be fally possible ill open space provision.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Use open space provision to provide biodiversity enhancements and access to greenspace for existing housing. Better assess corridor and core environmental network, retain this and enhance where possible. Use 'Green Hay Strewing' technique as best practice for creation of grassland areas. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within and on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the Broseley Conservation Area. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of early post-medieval coal workings (bell pits) are present across the site (HER PRN 04565), so site hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; 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.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	numerous trees around and within site, particularly areas in the central and northern parts of the site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	None
Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	None expected
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	None likely
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	F-t-
Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Proceed This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO030
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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)	Very High
Visual Impact Considerations:	
(from the LVSS)	High
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Via Woodlands Close
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
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	N
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	N. it would be difficult to justify permitting development (20 homes in this case) that increased the traffic along
Site Works Achievable?	Woodlands Road and northern section of King Street. This route is very narrow and lacking any footway in places.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	
Convenience Store & Public Transport	12
Service):	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	NOTIE
Ecology Comments	Grassland may be of interest but low risk. Low risk of Reptiles on site.
Other Constraints:	Grassiana may be of interest bat low risk. Low risk of heptiles off site.
Ecology Comments	
Management of Constraints:	Simple ecological assessment all that is required (Extended Phase 1).
management of constraints.	

Ecology Comments Opportunities: Heritage Comments	Opportunity to create linking corridor of woodland / hedgerow along eastern boundary to act as stepping stone for woods to north and south. See also standard list of opportunities.
Significant Constraints:	
Significant Constraints.	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site potentially within setting of Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on setting of WHS)
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	single tree near entrance on south western side of site
Other Constraints:	
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	Potential contaminated land conditions required due to off site contamination migrating.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation possible.
Public Protection Comments	
Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Fair
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO031
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	N-
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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	207
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	00/
surface flood risk zone:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	10/
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	00/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	00/
detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	INU
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	iviedium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-Low
(from the LVSS)	ivieulum-LOW
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	T
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	Y. This site would be able to deliver improvements to Floyer Lane. But suitable site access improvements onto
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Benthall Lane might be difficult to achieve. Access onto Bridge Road could be achieved.
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	N
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	Y. If the site access is on Bridge Road then check would need to be made at the Benthall Lane / Bridge Road
Site Works Achievable?	junction to ensure it was suitable to carry the additional traffic generated by the 84 home on this development.
Highway Assaultille Button (2)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport	15
Service):	
JET VICEJ.	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
	Fold required Company for hobitate CON (in read 20m to reath). Budget Date 11: 11: 11: 11: 11: 11: 11: 11: 11: 11
	EclA required. Surveys for habitats, GCN (in pond 20m to north), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants,
Ecology Comments	reptiles Majority of site is in the Environmental Network and, with additional survey, additional core / priority
Other Constraints:	habitat or corridor could be identified. Tree Preservation Orders on several roadside trees on or adjacent to this
	site. Likely to be key foraging site for bats and birds of prey like Owls and Kestrel. Anthills in earlier Street View
	indicates good quality grassland.
	Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Petain and enhance all hodgerous /tree lines on houndaries
Ecology Comments	Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance with CS17
Management of Constraints:	Environmental Networks and MD12. Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network
management of constraints.	unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision.
	difficely to be fully possible ill open space provision.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Grassland areas appear to have been better at some stage. Opportunities to restore these as part of any open space allocation exists. Green Hay Strewing should be used if this ever happens. Suggest green/brown roofs and reduce surface water run-off. Enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12. Position between two Local Wildlife Sites of similar habitat suggests lots of opportunities to enhance area. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within Broseley Conservation Area. HER, LIDAR and historic OS maps indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval coal workings are present across much the site (HER PRN 07284), so site hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	limited tree and scrub cover around and within site
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	Mine shafts and associated contamination likely. Potential noise from road.
Other Constraints:	Remediation where necessary for contaminated land. Regulatory Services are not experts in stability aspects
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	related with mine shafts and cannot comment other than to state that a stand off distance may be appropriate. Road noise could be mitigated through location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO032
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Voc
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	2%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	5%
surface flood risk zone: 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	A1.
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	Von High and Madison
(from the LVSS)	Very High and Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	High and Medium-Low
(from the LVSS)	nigii and Medium-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	'
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	N.
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point?	N
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	N. Floyer Lane is unsuitable for the additional traffic that is likely to be generated by the development which may
Reasonably be Made So?	potential involve 72 homes. Third party land would be needed to improve Floyer Lane.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	N
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	N. The Floyer Lane / Benthall Lane junction would need to be improved and third party land would be needed.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery, Convenience Store & Public Transport	14
Service):	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	None
Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	EcIA required. Surveys for habitats (in particular grassland), GCN (pond 15m to north), Badgers, Bats, nesting birds, vascular plants, reptiles (Grass-snake recorded nearby). Old buildings could be used as bird nesting sites, roosts for bats, and hibernation sites for reptiles and amphibians. Top corner of site is in the Environmental Network and, with additional survey, additional core / priority habitat or corridor could be identified. Likely to be key foraging site for bats and birds of prey like Owls and Kestrel.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Survey grassland between May and September. Protected species mitigation and enhancement. Retain and enhance all hedgerows/tree lines on boundaries. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Retain and improve hedges and hedgerow trees. Retain overgrown areas to north with ruins as hibernation site for amphibians and reptiles. This area of environmental network should be improved. A pond feature should be incorporated. Position between two Local Wildlife Sites of similar habitat suggests lots of opportunities to enhance area. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located on the boundary of, and within the setting, of the Broseley Conservation Area. HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of post-medieval clay and ironstone minding remains are present across much the site (HER PRN 33213), so site hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	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.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees to southern and western site boundaries
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Mine shafts and associated contamination potential on site.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation where necessary for contaminated land
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO036
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	V
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	40/
surface flood risk zone:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	20/
surface flood risk zone:	2%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	40/
surface flood risk zone:	4%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	00/
Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	20/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	001
detailed river network:	0%
All or part of the site within a Source	N =
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	NA-Altrica
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	NA - Book Lo
(from the LVSS)	Medium-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	V
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	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Y. Pound Lane adjacent to site would need to be improved for traffic and pedestrians.
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	N
Works?	
Highway Comments Are Envisaged Off	N. Pound Lane leading to the B4373 and the junction with the B4373 would need to be improved and third party
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	land would be needed. Y. If access can be achieved through the adjacent employment allocation directly onto the
Site Works Achievable?	B4373.
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	17
Convenience Store & Public Transport	1/
Service):	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	
	Partly within Env. Network. Paddocks to east may be unimproved grassland. Surveys of tightly grazed grasslands
Ecology Comments	are difficult and would require grass to be left to grow before survey. Area of scrub / woodland has interest,
Other Constraints:	could support protected species (including Dormice) and should be in the Env. Network. Area of overgrown
	grassland to north of this may also have interest in own right and may support reptiles.
	Folk manufacid Deduced combens of houston as acceptable of Folk and the Company of the Company o
Ecology Comments	EclA required. Reduced numbers of housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible
Management of Constraints:	in open space provision. Retain mature trees in field. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network to in
	accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks and MD12.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Retain and improve hedges, hedgerow trees and woodland/ scrub. Grassland area could be improved with more sympathetic management as meadow. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	HER indicates that eastern side of site previously formed part of The Dunge Brick and Tile Works (HER PRN 07237) and the associated Dunge Colliery and associated coal workings (HER PRN 07285), so site hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation).
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	boundary hedgerows and double internal hedgerow and copse of trees
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Incorporate central hedgerows and copse in open space and plant to connect to adjoining hedgerows.
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Potential contaminated land from past land use.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation likely to be possible for con land.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO037
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	N ₂
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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	20/
surface flood risk zone:	2%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	4%
surface flood risk zone:	470
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	10%
surface flood risk zone:	10%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	U70
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	U70
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	INO
Landscape Considerations:	Medium
(from the LVSS)	ivieulum
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-Low
(from the LVSS)	Wiedlatti-Low
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	1
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	Currently a bridleway
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	Y. But suitable visibility and access road width may not be achieved via the current bridleway access onto the
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	B4373 without acquiring third party land.
Reasonably be Made So?	2 10 / 2 William Galland Party Tarian
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	23
Convenience Store & Public Transport	
Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
organificante construinto.	
	Detential grand interest Entire and is comidentally to the delection of the control of the contr
Ecology Comments	Potential grassland interest. Entire area is corridor habitat and close to two core areas. The habitat might be
Other Constraints:	priority habitat. Some trees in the field and boundaries appear to be mature and could support bats. Movement
	of hedgehogs could be disrupted by any development if poorly planned.
Foology Comments	Curvey greecland between May and Contember Down one in washing as IABUSE City was blacked as
Ecology Comments	Survey grassland between May and September. Damp area in nearby Local Wildlife Site would need survey for
Management of Constraints:	potential as a breeding site for Great Crested Newts.

Ecology Comments	Ensure hedgehog friendly development that includes gaps in fence gravel boards, etc. Plan areas of open space
Opportunities:	that compliment the priority habitats to the west and south. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
significant constraints.	
Heritage Comments	HER indicates the earthwork and below ground remains of early post-medieval coal workings (bell pits) are
Other Constraints:	present across the site (HER PRN 04565), so site hold archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation).
Management of Constraints:	
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments	boundary trees and copse internal to central part of site
Other Constraints:	Soundary trees and copse internal to central part of site
T	
Tree Comments	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method
Management of Constraints:	Statement
Tree Comments	
Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	Potential contaminated land from past land use.
Other Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments	
Management of Constraints:	Remediation likely to be possible for con land.
Public Protection Comments	
Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Good
Appraisal: Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Strategic Considerations.	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Flan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.
	See comments from relevant service areas.
	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented.
	See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	Supple Juneary Balancia recommendation and comm
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO039
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	165
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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	100/0
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-High
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
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	Υ
Works?	
Uishway Campanta And Environmed Off	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	21
Convenience Store & Public Transport	21
Service):	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	
	Top field of site is in the Environmental Network Species found pearby and petentially an site are Hedgeber
Ecology Comments	Top field of site is in the Environmental Network. Species found nearby and potentially on site are Hedgehog, Dingy Skipper, Slow-worm, Common Lizard, other butterfly and moth species that have been recorded nearby at
· ·	
Other Constraints:	The Haycop Local Wildlife Site nearby. Some potential for the same species to occur on the boundaries and also
	the rough area to the north east of the site.
	EcIA required. In particular of edges of site and rough corner at the north east of the site. Boundary trees and
Ecology Comments	hedgerows should be retained where possible. Survey of reptiles over summer (avoiding July and August when
Management of Constraints:	possible). A wide buffer to the south where the Haycop Local Wildlife Site is close by. Reduced numbers of
	housing as protection of Environmental Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision.
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Ensure hedgehog friendly development that includes gaps in fence gravel boards, etc. Plan areas of open space that compliment the priority habitats to the west and south. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Large site which included the site of the site of Yew Tree Mine (HER PRN 33000) and therefore has archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation).
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	isolated trees and hedgerows within and around site boundaries. Borders wider woodland network to north and east
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development. Connect to woodland to north and east
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Potential contaminated land from past land use in the area. Possible road noise issues.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation likely to be possible for con land. Noise can be mitigated by glazing and orientation of buildings to shelter garden areas
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	Good
Appraisal:	
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO040
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
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:	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	2
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-High
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	Assumes speed limit has been outsided as a result of the Limby Crange development on the experite side of the
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Assumes speed limit has been extended as a result of the Linney Grange development on the opposite side of the
Reasonably be Made So?	Coalport Rd. Planning a shared access point with BRO041 could be considered if both sites progress.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Site Works Acine vable:	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	21
Convenience Store & Public Transport	
Service):	
Facility Comments	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	
Ecology Comments	
Other Constraints:	Potential grassland interest including in the wide road verge on north west corner.
Street Constraints.	
Ecology Comments	EclA required. Survey grassland between May and September. Include survey of road verge in north west corner.
Management of Constraints:	Significant boundary trees are present which should, with hedgerows, be retained where possible.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Seek to open up the footpath to the west and combine with open space provision. See also standard list of opportunities.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	N/A
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	N/A (NB. Condition advised for an archaeological watching brief on a 2015 application)
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Archaeological watching brief condition on any PP
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees around site boundaries.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Potential contamination from off site sources. Potential road noise.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation available. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
Reasoning	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO041
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	V
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:	1%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	201
surface flood risk zone:	3%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	
surface flood risk zone:	8%
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:	21%
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-High
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Y. Existing speed limit on Coalport Road will need to be extended. Planning a shared access point with BRO040
Reasonably be Made So?	could be considered if both sites progress.
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	'
VVOIRS!	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Assassibility Pating (Out Of 24)	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24) (Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	
Convenience Store & Public Transport	20
Service):	
Scrutcej.	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	None
S.g.ng.cant constraints.	
	The area is bisected by Environmental Network that follows the hedge and watercourse across the site. This
Ecology Comments	water course flows into Corbett's Dingle Local Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland which clearly has implications
Other Constraints:	for drainage. Culverting of watercourses is rarely approved as part of Open Water Consents that would likely be
	required for this site. Mature in-field and boundary trees are present. The grassland at this site may be of
	interest.
	EcIA required. Survey grassland between May and September. Significant boundary trees are present which
Ecology Comments	should, with hedgerows, be retained where possible. Water course should be built into any design as an open
Management of Constraints:	water feature and incorporated into SUDS.
	Water readure and incommated into 5005
	water reature and incorporated into 3003.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	In addition to the standard list of opportunities the water course could be enhanced with good design that doesn't reply on culverting. The Environmental Network should be enhanced.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
o.g.n.j.ca.n.c concarames.	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Medium sized site, so may have some archaeological potential
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment +?evaluation).
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees around site boundaries and within site.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Seek to retain internal tree and hedgerow within open space within site
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Potential contamination from off site sources. Potential road noise.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation available. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments	
Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	employment Buildenines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	BRO043
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	Yes
Agricultural Land Quality:	res
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	1%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	4%
surface flood risk zone: 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	N/O
Protection Zone:	NO NO
Landscape Considerations:	Madium
(from the LVSS)	Medium
Visual Impact Considerations:	Medium-High
(from the LVSS)	ivieulum-riign
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	·
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	N
Development at the Access Point?	IN
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	Y. Existing speed limit on Coalport Road will need to be extended.
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off- Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	20
Convenience Store & Public Transport	20
Service):	
Ecology Comments	
Ecology Comments Significant Constraints:	None
Significant constraints.	
Ecology Comments Other Constraints:	The eastern boundary that follows the hedgerow and watercourse forms an Env. Network corridor. This watercourse flows into Corbetts Dingle Local Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland, which has implications for drainage. Culverting of watercourses is rarely approved as part of Open Water Consents that would likely be required for this site. Potential grassland interest including in the wide road verge on north west corner. Requires botanical survey, EcIA and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting birds. Hedgerows, trees and watercourse will need to be buffered.
Ecology Comments Management of Constraints:	Water course should be built into any design as an open water feature and incorporated into SUDS. 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.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Seek to open up the footpath to the west and combine with open space provision. The watercourse could be enhanced with good design that doesn't rely on culverting.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Medium sized site, so may have some archaeological potential. Condition advised for an archaeological watching brief on a 2015 application on part of the site.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment +?evaluation). Archaeological watching brief condition on any PP.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	individual TPO trees around boundary and within site
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	hedgerows and mature trees on site boundaries
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Seek to retain internal trees within open space within site
Tree Comments Opportunities:	enhance tree cover within site, to deliver net gain for biodiversity.
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Site is in area of known coal mining and contaminated land vicinity. Site investigation would be required.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Good
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	JKD002
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	N-
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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?	Υ
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	V
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Y
Development at the Access Point?	
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	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	19
Convenience Store & Public Transport	
Service):	
5 / 6	
Ecology Comments	None
Significant Constraints:	
	All the woodland to the couth west is listed as under a TRO. Bentile, bedeen bets marked binds and are a Society
Foology Comments	All the woodland to the south west is listed as under a TPO. Reptile, badger, bats, nesting birds and even Dormice
Ecology Comments	could be present. The small woodlands may also be of interest. While not listed on our maps the woodland is
Other Constraints:	clearly either corridor or perhaps core habitat in the Environmental Network. The maps will be adjusted
	accordingly. A reduced number of houses may be required to allow for the network / core habitat and TPO.
Ecology Comments	EclA required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are picked
Management of Constraints:	up. Reptile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow reptiles to become
	used to them. A buffer should be included to the woodland.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	In addition to the standard list of opportunities the woodland could be enhanced. The Environmental Network should be enhanced and woodland edge habitat promoted. If reptiles are found then ground features that can be used for hibernation and basking should be incorporated into the open space.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Site formed part of the Rock Tile Works (HER PRN 07242) and also contains mine workings (HER PRN 07283), so holds archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	Belt of TPO woodland occupies north-west to south-east side of site.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	trees to north-east site boundary.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees. Development stand-off from protected woodland.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments	Potential contamination from historic land use on and in the vicinity of the site. Possible noise impact from
Other Constraints: Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	industrial estate to the east. Remediation likely to be possible for contaminated land. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation Reasoning	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation Design Requirements:	

Site Reference: JJC003 JJC00	
Millierot Safeguarding Area? Wholly or Partity Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wery High Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access, Can One Reasonably be Achieved? And Highway Network? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Highway Comments - Existing Highway to Racess Point I fix siting Highway to Racess Point I fix siting Highway to Racess Point I fix siting Highway Comments - I fix siting Highway to Racess Point I fix siting Highway Comments - Guild the Development Occur Without Off-Site Ver Wilshay Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Ver Wilshay Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site	
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3 No Agricultural Land Quality: O%	
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: O% Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - If No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Natioble for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Con It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Development Occur Without Off-Site	
Agricultural Land Quality: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3: Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Pratection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fi No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Fixsting Highway Sutable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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 Development Cour Without Off-Site Percentage of site in Tiou One One One Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site	
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in Hood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fi 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? 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 Percentage of the site in the 100% No Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Percentage of the site in the 100% No Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development occur Without Off-Site	
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2: Percentage of the site in Hood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Fi 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? 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 Percentage of the site in the 100% No Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development occur Without Off-Site Percentage of the site in the 100% No Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development occur Without Off-Site	
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1: Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Indiscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? Highway Comments - I No Direct Access, Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point? Highway Comments - Existing Highway ot Access Point? Highway Comments - Could the Development Cocur Without Off-Site Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface and the surface and the surface and the Cour Without Off-Site Protection Seasonably Be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site	
Percentage of the site in the 30 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site with in 2,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailled river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? All or part of the site within 2 highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? Highway Comments - Fixisting Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development - Cour Without Off-Site Proventing flood from the Cour Without Off-Site No Suitable For Traffic Associated with the Development - Cour Without Off-Site Proventing flood from the Cour Without Off-Site Proventing flood from the Cour Without Off-Site Proventing flood from the Cour Without Off-Site	
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? Highway Comments - Existing Highway at Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High Way Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Very High Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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 Y	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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 Y	
surface flood risk zone: Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Wisual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to 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? 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 Y O% O% O% O% O% O% O% O% O%	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	
Historic Flood Map: Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? 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? 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	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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 Y	
historic flood event: Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zane: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? Highway Network? 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? 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	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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 No No No No No No No No No N	
detailed river network: All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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 No No No No No No No No No N	
All or part of the site within a Source Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	
Protection Zone: Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High High High High High Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	\dashv
Landscape Considerations: (from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) High High High High High High High Y Highway Comments - Direct Access to 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? 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	
(from the LVSS) Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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 Y	
Visual Impact Considerations: (from the LVSS) Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	
Highway Comments - Direct Access to Highway Network? 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? 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	
Highway Network? 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? 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	
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? 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	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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	
How? Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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 Y	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the Development at the Access Point? 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	
Development at the Access Point? 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	
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	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Y	
Reasonably be Made So? Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Y	
Highway Comments - Could the Development Occur Without Off-Site Y	
Development Occur Without Off-Site Y	
Works?	
WOTAS!	-
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	
Convenience Store & Public Transport	
Service):	
Sci vicej.	
Ecology Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
	$\neg \neg$
	,. l
Ecology Comments Site is nearly surrounded by woodland, some of which is within the site. To the east and south this woodla	
Other Constraints: also within the Ecological Network and is listed as priority habitat. Bats, badgers, nesting birds and Dormice	ould
be present. Other areas of the site may also support reptiles	
EcIA required. The woodland should be surveyed in Spring or early summer to ensure spring flowers are pi	
up. Rentile survey mats should be installed early in the year or late the previous year to allow rentiles to be	ked
Management of Constraints: used to them. A buffer should be included to the woodland.	
asea to them. A barrer should be included to the woodidha.	

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	In addition to the standard list of opportunities the woodland could be enhanced. The Environmental Network should be enhanced and woodland edge habitat promoted. If reptiles are found then ground features that can be used for hibernation and basking should be incorporated into the open space.
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Site formed part of the Rock Tile Works (HER PRN 07242) and also contains mine workings (HER PRN 07283), so holds archaeological interest. ?some of the present buildings on site may be historic industrial buildings.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; ?Level 2 historic building recording; impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	
Significant Constraints: Tree Comments	
Other Constraints:	site surrounded by mature trees - part of ironbridge gorge woodland network
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement. Particular attention to size, number and location of dwellings around periphery of site, in order to create sustainable juxtaposition of houses and trees.
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to enhance tree cover within site, in association with future development.
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Contaminated land due to past and existing land uses. Potential noise from industrial site to the east.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Remediation likely to be possible for contaminated land. Potential to mitigate noise by location of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment. Significant noise mitigation measures likely which may slightly reduce the number of properties possible on site.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	Potential to remove potential noise sources for nearby residential properties if this site was developed for residential.
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability	
Appraisal:	Fair
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and employment guidelines identified for the town.
If proposed for Allocation, Potential Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	JKD004
Coal Authority Reference Area?	No
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	No
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
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	0%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	1%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	9%
surface flood risk zone:	
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	0%
Historic Flood Map:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	0%
historic flood event:	
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	0%
detailed river network:	577
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	
Landscape Considerations:	Very High
(from the LVSS)	VCI y TIIGH
Visual Impact Considerations:	High
(from the LVSS)	111811
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	Υ
Highway Network?	'
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	B4373
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	Υ
Development at the Access Point?	
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	Υ
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	
Convenience Store & Public Transport	20
Service):	
Ecology Comments	If priority habitats are present then the site should not be developed. If priority habitats not present, boundary
Significant Constraints:	vegetation should be retained, enhanced and buffered, reducing developable area.
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	The site former on Fact Materials associated
	The site forms an Env. Network corridor.
Ecology Comments	The site may contain priority habitat - botanical survey required. If priority habitats are present then the site
Other Constraints:	should not be developed.
	Requires botanical survey, Ecla and surveys for bats, GCNs (ponds within 500m), badgers, reptiles and nesting
	birds.
5 / 6	If priority habitat, site should not be developed. If not priority habitat: protected and priority species and habitats
Ecology Comments	mitigation and enhancement, retain and enhance mature trees/hedgerows/tree lines and protect adjacent
Management of Constraints:	priority habitats. Protect, enhance and restore Env. Network in accordance with CS17 Environmental Networks
	and MD12.

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Site could potentially be restored/enhanced as priority habitat. See accompanying document
Heritage Comments	
Significant Constraints: Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located adjacent to the boundary, and within the setting, of the Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Historic editions of the OS map indicates that at least one mine shaft is present on the site.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA; archaeological Desk Based Assessment + ?evaluation). High quality design for development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS.
Heritage Comments Opportunities:	
Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	abuts conservation area to the east.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	open rough grassland site with scrubby trees and shrubs mostly around the perimeter. Adjoins extensive deciduous woodland to the south and east
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arb Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arb Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	Use 20% canopy cover policy to extend woodland cover and create 15m buffer with the woodland to the south and east
Public Protection Comments Significant Constraints:	
Public Protection Comments Other Constraints:	Possible contaminated land due to past land use. Possible noise from road to west. Possible stability issues however this steps outside of my remit.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Con land remediation likely to be available. Mitigate noise by location (separation distances to the road) of dwellings, orientation and room layout as well as glazing and boundary treatment.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation? Recommendation	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Reasoning	A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	employment guidelines identified for the town.
Capacity: If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	
Design requirements.	

Site Assessment - Stage 3	
Site Reference:	JKD004VAR
Coal Authority Reference Area?	Yes
Mineral Safeguarding Area?	Yes
Wholly or Partly Grade 1, 2 and/or 3	NI-
Agricultural Land Quality:	No
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 3:	100%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 2:	0%
Percentage of site in Flood Zone 1:	0%
Percentage of the site in the 30 year	20/
surface flood risk zone:	2%
Percentage of the site in the 100 year	COV.
surface flood risk zone:	6%
Percentage of the site in the 1,000 year	170/
surface flood risk zone:	17%
Percentage of the site identified on the EA	00/
Historic Flood Map:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of an	00/
historic flood event:	0%
Percentage of the site within 20m of a	209/
detailed river network:	20%
All or part of the site within a Source	No
Protection Zone:	No
Landscape Considerations:	Von High
(from the LVSS)	Very High
Visual Impact Considerations:	Lliab
(from the LVSS)	High
Highway Comments - Direct Access to	
Highway Network?	У
Highway Comments - If No Direct Access,	
Can One Reasonably Be Achieved? And	B4373
How?	
Highway Comments - Existing Highway	Development accessed off B4373 Ironbridge Road, likely to be able to accommodate development, subject to
Suitable for Traffic Associated with the	achieving satisfactory access and potential improvements to ironbridge road.
Development at the Access Point?	acineving satisfactory access and potential improvements to nonvinge road.
Highway Comments - If Existing Highway at	
Access Point is Not Suitable, Can It	У
Reasonably be Made So?	
Highway Comments - Could the	
Development Occur Without Off-Site	No
Works?	
Highway Comments - Are Envisaged Off-	
Site Works Achievable?	Yes - necessary improvements should be achievable
Highways Accessibility Rating (Out Of 24)	
(Based on Primary School, GP Surgery,	20
Convenience Store & Public Transport	
Service):	
Ecology Comments	SC Ecology unlikely to support development on this site.
Ecology Comments	The site forms an Environmental Network corridor, due to the presence of woodland and brook. CS17 Environmental Networks applies. Reduced numbers of housing would be required as protection of Environmental
Significant Constraints:	Network unlikely to be fully possible in open space provision.
	The state of the s
Ecology Comments	EcIA and botanical survey required and surveys for badgers, bats, GCNs, water voles, otters, white-clawed
Other Constraints:	crayfish, nesting birds and reptiles
Street Constraints.	
Ecology Comments	Protected and priority species and habitats mitigation and enhancements. Protect, enhance and restore Env.
Management of Constraints:	Network in accordance with CS17and MD12

Ecology Comments Opportunities:	Not recommended for inclusion in allocated sites
Heritage Comments Significant Constraints:	
Heritage Comments Other Constraints:	Site located within/adjoins Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site and Severn Gorge Conservation Area. Site contains mine workings (HER PRN 07283), so holds archaeological interest.
Heritage Comments Management of Constraints:	Heritage Assessment required with application (archaeological Desk Based Assessment + evaluation; impact on Outstanding Universal Value of WHS and character and appearance of CA). High quality design for residential or employment development necessary to minimise any impacts on the setting of the CA and WHS.
Heritage Comments	
Opportunities: Tree Comments Significant Constraints:	site within/adjoins ironbridge / jackfield conservation area and world heritage site and is a natural extension of and buffer to it in terms of habitat and landscape.
Tree Comments Other Constraints:	extensive scrub and mature woodland covering north, east and south of site.
Tree Comments Management of Constraints:	Standard BS5837 tree survey / constraints analysis. Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Protection Plan & Arboricultural Method Statement
Tree Comments Opportunities:	To protect and extend woodland cover and integrate the development into the broader landscape through the sustainable use of existing landscape features. Plan for suitable development stand-off from woodland and links to new planting within the site.
Public Protection Comments	
Significant Constraints: Public Protection Comments	
Other Constraints:	Known noise source to east and north. Contaminated land and mining.
Public Protection Comments Management of Constraints:	Parts of the site may be unsuitable due to proximity to industrial noise sources.
Public Protection Comments Opportunities:	
Conclusion - Stage 2a Sustainability Appraisal:	Poor
Strategic Considerations:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Known Infrastructure Requirements to make Development Suitable in Planning Terms:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Known Infrastructure Opportunities:	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. Relevant supporting studies should be undertaken and their recommendations implemented. See comments from relevant service areas.
Potential for Windfall?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Potential for Allocation?	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
Recommendation Reasoning	To be determined through the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Broseley. This will identify the strategy for achieving the housing and
If proposed for Allocation, Potential	employment guidelines identified for the town.
Capacity:	
If proposed for Allocation	
Design Requirements:	