

P1

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P1
Site Address / Location	Old Crosses
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.11
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Garden
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - potential to create this through existing access to the house.

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - potential to create this through existing access to the house.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - potential to create this through existing access to the house.

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines on adjacent road

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	300m	482m	17000m	643m	17000m	643m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible, Grade II Listed Old Crosses</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Outside and not connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	6-10 years, 11-15 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	1 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	6-10 years, 11-15 years
Other key information	Site located at entrance to the village where the national speed limit becomes 30mph
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. It appears to be in use as a garden shared between two houses. The site is at the north western end of the village but within walking distance of village services. Development of the site would be infill development between existing houses.</p> <p>Any development proposal would need to demonstrate there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area (Core Strategy Policy SD4). A safe point of access to the site would need to be established particularly as the site is at the entrance to the village with a change from national speed limit to 30mph. Access could potentially use one of the existing access points, creating a shared access.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>Any development proposal would also require a design which limits impacts on the nearby Grade II listed Old Crosses.</p> <p>This site would be suitable for 1 -2 dwellings.</p>

P2

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P2
Site Address / Location	Land west of Burghope Orchard
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	3.07
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	HLAA/031/001
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	SHLAA, NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural and residential



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Uneven

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes – via Burghope orchard

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes – via Burghope orchard
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Site access from Burghope Orchard.

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Yes, within - Mature trees observed

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Utilities observed at site access and settlement core. Overhead lines noted in land parcel.

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	80m	30m	17000m	320m	17000m	320m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible, Grade II Listed Tally Ho, The White House and Mason's Cottage</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>A mix of greenfield and previously developed land</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	16-20 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	1-2 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	16-20 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is at the core of the village and is currently in use as an agricultural yard and is therefore brownfield land. The site is screened from the adjacent road by hedges and mature trees. There is access to the site via Burghope Orchard, at the end of a cul-de-sac. Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4. A wider site was submitted to the 2015 Herefordshire SHLAA and was concluded as not suitable. The part of the site assessed in this proforma is the smaller portion submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites.</p> <p>There is steep topography between the street and the site, which may limit the developable area.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>The site would be suitable for limited redevelopment of approximately 1-2 dwellings.</p>

P3

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P3
Site Address / Location	Land at Burghope Orchard
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.15
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Garden
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Residential



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes – via Burghope orchard

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes – via Burghope orchard.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes – via Burghope orchard

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	320m	110m	17000m	320m	17000m	320m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Heritage Constraints


2. Assessment of Suitability


<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	A mix of greenfield and previously developed land
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Within the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	6-10 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	3 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	6-10 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The site is currently a garden with housing as neighbouring uses on all sides. The site is screened from the road by hedgerows. There is access to the site via Burghope Orchard.</p> <p>A bus stop with a weekly service is located at the street front edge of this site. Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 3 dwellings.</p>

P4

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P4
Site Address / Location	Loden View
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	18.02
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	O/Pen/005
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	SHLAA, NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Residential, sewage works located within





2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: **Low Risk**
- Flood Zone 2: **Medium Risk**
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): **Medium Risk**
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): **High Risk**

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – **Low Risk**
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – **Medium Risk**

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines on street access, sewage works to the east

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	300m	160m	17000m	600m	17000m	600m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.


Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible, Grade II Listed Cotswold House</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>A mix of greenfield and previously developed land</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	N/A
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	Site located at entrance to the village where the national speed limit becomes 30mph
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Red: The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is unsuitable for the development proposed. This is a large sites located on agricultural and grass land and includes the sewage works. There is currently no access apart from through the driveway of the dwelling on the site, which would be limited. Development of the whole site within the boundary shown would be disproportionate with the village size and infrastructure and would be inappropriate to the context. The site is high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land and development also may have adverse impacts on the Grade II listed Cotswold House. It is also within the River Lugg Catchment and would not be supported unless a lack of adverse effects can be demonstrated. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may also render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers. A smaller site was submitted to the 2015 Herefordshire SHLAA and was concluded as not suitable, although part of the site has recently been developed.</p>

P5

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P5
Site Address / Location	Old Post Office, Pencombe
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.43
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Orchard and outbuildings
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Residential
	[Site photo required]

2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Priority Habitat Traditional Orchard

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - near Causeway Cottage

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - near Causeway Cottage.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - near Causeway Cottage

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	320m	170m	17000m	300m	17000m	300m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible, Grade II Listed Causeway Cottage</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years, 6-10 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	N/A
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years, 6-10 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Red: The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	The site is not suitable for the development proposed. It is an enclosed site, which includes a Traditional orchard. The site is designated as a Priority Habitat. Access to the site may also be an issue. It is also within the River Lugg Catchment which is subject to Herefordshire Core Strategy Policy SD4. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may also render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

P6

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P6
Site Address / Location	Land adjacent Poppybank
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.90
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural and residential



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Gently sloping

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road. Clear visibility 100m in both directions.

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road.

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Yes, within - Mature trees observed

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines along central field boundary

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	<400m	160m	17000m	480m	17000m	480m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints



2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	12 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The site is located on the southern edge of the settlement. The site is used as agricultural land. The site is screened by hedges fronting the road. The site has access from the road.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>Any development may have potential for high landscape sensitivity due to its elevated nature - this would need to be verified by a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Assessment.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 12 dwellings.</p>

P7

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P7
Site Address / Location	Land north and east of New House Farm
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.49
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	O/Pen/001
Existing land use	Grazing field
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	SHLAA, NP Call for Sites
Planning history	P152917/F - Proposed four detached two storey houses - Approved on 04 December 2015
Neighbouring uses	Residential

2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Medium Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road in the south

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road in the south. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road in the south

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Just past Wakefield before entrance to Newtse Farm

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines on the road and some to the parcel behind

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	320m	350m	17000m	320m	17000m	320m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.



Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	A mix of greenfield and previously developed land
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years, 6-10 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	15 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years, 6-10 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The site is located on the western edge of the settlement. The site is used as a grazing field bounded by housing to the north and east and agricultural industry to the west. The site is screened by trees fronting the road to the south. The site has access from the south.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 15 dwellings.</p>

P8

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P8
Site Address / Location	Land north of Springfield, Risbury Road
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.13
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	O/Pen/004
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	SHLAA, NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural
 	

2. Assessment of Suitability	
Environmental Constraints	
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:</p> <p>Yes / No / partly or adjacent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland • Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) • Biosphere Reserve • Local Nature Reserve (LNR) • National Nature Reserve (NNR) • National Park • Ramsar Site • Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)* • Special Area of Conservation (SAC) • Special Protection Area (SPA) <p><i>*Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?</i></p>	<p>Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation</p> <p>No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone</p> <p>Distance to SSSI is >5500m</p> <p>The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:</p> <p>Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Infrastructure Corridor • Local Wildlife Site (LWS) • Public Open Space • Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) • Nature Improvement Area • Regionally Important Geological Site • Other 	<p>No</p>
<p>Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?</p> <p>Yes / No</p>	<p>Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC</p>
<p>Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?</p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood Zone 1: Low Risk • Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk • Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk • Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk 	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p>Site is at risk of surface water flooding?</p> <p>See guidance notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk • >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk 	<p>Low Risk</p>
<p>Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?</p> <p>Yes / No / Unknown</p>	<p>Yes - Grade 2</p>

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Uneven (Level change from main road access to settlement.
Vegetated bank verge)

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed and level change from street

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed and level change from street. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed and level change from street

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	320m	320m	17000m	480m	17000m	480m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	N/A
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Red: The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is unsuitable for the development proposed. The site is elongated and is located on the northern edge of the settlement. The site is currently used as agricultural land.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>The site does not have access and steep topography could make the site more difficult to develop. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may also render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land.</p>

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P9
Site Address / Location	Land behind New House Farm Bungalow
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	1.40
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural and residential



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines at road side boundary of site

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	320m	180m	17000m	400m	17000m	400m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.


Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	Yes

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	20 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The site is located to the west of the settlement. The site is currently in agricultural use. The site is screened by trees to on its boundaries to the east, west and south. Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 20 dwellings.</p>

P10

1. Site Details		
Site Reference / Name	P10	
Site Address / Location	Great Hegdon Farm	
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.90	
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A	
Existing land use	Agricultural	
Land use being considered	Housing	
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown	
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites	
Planning history	N/A	
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural	
		[Site photo required]

2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed and level change from street

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed and level change from street. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed and level change from street

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines at road side boundary of site

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	500m	482m	17000m	643m	17000m	643m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible, Grade II Listed Old Crosse</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	1 dwelling
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown

<p>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</p> <p>The site is suitable and available</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</p> <p>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</p>	<p>Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</p>
<p>Summary of justification for rating</p>	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This small site forms part of agricultural land to the north west of Pencombe, adjacent to the existing built up area. A safe point of access to the site would need to be established particularly as the site is at the entrance to the village with a change from national speed limit to 30mph. Any development may have potential for high visual sensitivity due to the site's elevated nature - this would need to be verified by a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Assessment.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>Development on this site would result in an extension to the village with no footpath, therefore may not be supported.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 1 dwelling.</p>

P11

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P11
Site Address / Location	Land on the north side of C1110 opposite Swalcliffe House to Telephone Exchange
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.36
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No but potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Bromyard Road

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No but potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Bromyard Road.

There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No but potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Bromyard Road

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Yes, within - Mature trees observed

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	500m	482m	17000m	160m	17000m	160m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality), Core Strategy Policy RA2 (Housing in settlements outside Hereford and the market towns)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	N/A
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	Site located at entrance to the village where the national speed limit becomes 30mph
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Red: The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is unsuitable for the development proposed. This site is a portion of an agricultural field, on the eastern edge of the settlement.</p> <p>There is no development on this side of the road, therefore any development on this site would be encroaching into open countryside. Any development may result in likely high landscape impact - this would have to be verified by a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Assessment. As there is no defensible boundary to enclose development.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land and loss of hedgerows.</p> <p>Residential development on this site would be inappropriate in the context of Core Strategy Policy RA2. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may also render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p>

P12

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P12
Site Address / Location	Land on the south side of C1110 adjacent to the Telephone exchange, running east
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.20
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural and residential. Old telephone exchange and access to sewage station adjacent.



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No but potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Bromyard Road

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No but potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Bromyard Road.

There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No but potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Bromyard Road

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Yes, within - Mature trees observed

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines within field parcel

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	500m	500m	17000m	160m	17000m	160m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	3 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	Site located at entrance to the village where the national speed limit becomes 30mph
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>This site is a portion of agricultural land, on the eastern edge of the settlement. Given the proximity to the settlement core, and adjacent housing, there is reasonable development potential.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade2) agricultural land.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 3 dwellings.</p>

P13

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P13
Site Address / Location	Land east of C1117 Pencombe to Gasbeage Road and south of Loden View
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.22
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Agricultural



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - PRoW runs across the site and would have to be re-routed

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Yes, within - Mature trees observed

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines on street access

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	500m	320m	17000m	480m	17000m	480m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

High sensitivity: the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Medium sensitivity: the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability



<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible / Some impact, and/or mitigation possible / Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Outside and not connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to / Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	1-2 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	Site located at entrance to the village where the national speed limit becomes 30mph
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown

<p>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</p> <p>The site is suitable and available</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</p> <p>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</p>	<p>Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable</p>
<p>Summary of justification for rating</p>	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The site is located on the southern edge of the settlement. The site is used a agricultural land. The site is screened by hedges fronting the road. The site has access from the road.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>Any development proposals would have to consider the potential loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. Any development may result in likely high landscape impact - this would have to be verified by a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Assessment.</p> <p>A safe point of access to the site would need to be established particularly as the site is at the entrance to the village with a change from national speed limit to 30mph. There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 1-2 dwellings, as an extension to the row of existing dwellings but not as significant encroachment into open countryside.</p>

P14

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P14
Site Address / Location	Cotswold House
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.40
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	N/A
Existing land use	Part wooded garden land
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	NP Call for Sites
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Residential



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Gate access from road. Potential to create new access through existing hedge to exit directly onto C1117 Pencombe-Little Cowarne Road

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Overhead lines on street boundaries

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	300m	160m	17000m	600m	17000m	600m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible, Grade II Listed Cotswold House</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>A mix of greenfield and previously developed land</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	0-5 years
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	2 dwellings
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	0-5 years
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green) The site is suitable and available The site is potentially suitable, and available . The site is not currently suitable, and available .	Amber: The site is potentially suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>The site is potentially suitable for housing and therefore potentially appropriate for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The site is currently a garden with housing to the north and west. The site is located in the south of the village. The site is enclosed due to vegetation and is screened from the road by trees.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p> <p>The site includes the Grade II Listed Cotswold house and any development in the grounds would require removal of mature trees and vegetation. Development would need to be limited and sensitive in design to respect the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>This site has capacity for approximately 2 dwellings.</p>

P15

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P15
Site Address / Location	Land west of Court Farm
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.80
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	O/Pen/002
Existing land use	Grassland
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	SHLAA
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Residential



2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Low Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - National Habitat Network Enhancement Zone 1

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	100m	80m	17000m	350m	17000m	350m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Medium sensitivity: the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

High sensitivity: the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible, Grade II Listed Pencombe War Memorial, K6 Telephone Kiosk, The White House and Outbuilding Immediately North West of Court Farmhouse</p>
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	<p>Unknown</p>
<p>Planning Policy Constraints</p>	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)</p>
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	<p>Greenfield</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area</p>
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	<p>No</p>

3. Assessment of Availability	
Is the site available for development? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Yes
Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	No
Is there a known time frame for availability? <i>Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years</i>	Unknown
4. Assessment of Viability	
Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement? <i>Yes / No / Unknown</i>	Unknown
5. Conclusions	
What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	N/A
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	Unknown
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown

<p>Overall rating (Red/Amber/Green)</p> <p>The site is suitable and available</p> <p>The site is potentially suitable, and available.</p> <p>The site is not currently suitable, and available.</p>	<p>Red: The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable</p>
<p>Summary of justification for rating</p>	<p>This site was submitted to the 2015 Herefordshire SHLAA and was concluded to be unsuitable. It was not submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites but was has been assessed due to being in the public domain and in Pencombe.</p> <p>The site is unsuitable for the development proposed. This small site forms part of agricultural land to west of St John's Church.</p> <p>The conclusions from the SHLAA remain relevant having stated development on this site can cause potential adverse harm to the historic core of the village in this particular sensitive setting.</p> <p>Any development may have potential for high visual sensitivity due to its elevated nature - this would need to be verified by a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Assessment. Development on this site could result in the loss of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may also render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p>

P16

1. Site Details	
Site Reference / Name	P16
Site Address / Location	Land south of Old Rectory, Bromyard Road
Gross Site Area (Hectares)	0.49
SHLAA/SHELAA Reference (if applicable)	O/Pen/003
Existing land use	Agricultural
Land use being considered	Housing
Development Capacity (Proposed by Landowner or SHLAA/HELAA)	Unknown
Site identification method / source	SHLAA
Planning history	N/A
Neighbouring uses	Residential and grassland, sewage works to the south
	[Site photo required]

2. Assessment of Suitability

Environmental Constraints

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent

- Ancient Woodland
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Biosphere Reserve
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- National Nature Reserve (NNR)
- National Park
- Ramsar Site
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)*
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Special Protection Area (SPA)

**Does the site fall within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone and would the proposed use/development trigger the requirement to consult Natural England?*

Yes - River Lugg, part of River Wye Special Area of Conservation
No - Hill Hole Dingle SSSI Impact Risk Zone
Distance to SSSI is >5500m
The proposed development is unlikely to pose a risk to SSSIs. The Local Planning Authority does not normally need to consult Natural England on this proposal regarding likely impacts on SSSIs

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to the following non statutory environmental designations:

Yes / No / partly or adjacent / Unknown

- Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Local Wildlife Site (LWS)
- Public Open Space
- Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)
- Nature Improvement Area
- Regionally Important Geological Site
- Other

No

Site falls within a habitats site which may require nutrient neutrality, or is likely to fall within its catchment?

Yes / No

Yes - River Lugg and Wye SAC

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within Flood Zones 2 or 3?

See guidance notes:

- Flood Zone 1: Low Risk
- Flood Zone 2: Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (less or more vulnerable site use): Medium Risk
- Flood Zone 3 (highly vulnerable site use): High Risk

Low Risk

Site is at risk of surface water flooding?

See guidance notes:

- Less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low Risk
- >15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Medium Risk

Medium Risk

Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Grade 2

2. Assessment of Suitability

Site contains habitats with the potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife-rich habitats? Is the site part of:

- UK BAP Priority Habitat;
- a wider ecological network (including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity);
- wildlife corridors (and stepping stones that connect them); and/or
- an area identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes - Priority Habitat Traditional Orchard

Site is predominantly, or wholly, within or adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Physical Constraints

Is the site:

Flat or relatively flat / Gently sloping or uneven / Steeply sloping

Relatively flat

Is there existing vehicle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed

Is there existing pedestrian access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed.
There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.

Is there existing cycle access to the site, or potential to create suitable access?

Yes / No / Unknown

No - none observed

Are there any Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there any known Tree Preservation Orders on the site?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Are there veteran/ancient trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Are there other significant trees within or adjacent to the site?

Within / Adjacent / No / Unknown

Unknown

Is the site likely to be affected by ground contamination?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

2. Assessment of Suitability

Is there any utilities infrastructure crossing the site i.e. power lines/pipe lines, or is the site in close proximity to hazardous installations?

Yes / No / Unknown

Unknown

Would development of the site result in a loss of social, amenity or community value?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Accessibility

Distances to community facilities and services should be measured using walking routes from the centre of each site to each facility. The distances are based on the assumption that 400m is equal to approximately 5 minutes' walk and are measured from the edge of the site.

Facilities	Town / local centre / shop	Bus / Tram Stop	Train station	Primary School	Secondary School	Open Space / recreation facilities	Cycle Route
Distance (metres)	320m	400m	17000m	160m	17000m	160m	17000m

Landscape and Visual Constraints

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of landscape?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site has many valued features, and/or valued features that are susceptible to development but could potentially accommodate some change with appropriate mitigation.
- **High sensitivity:** the site has highly valued features, and/or valued features that are highly susceptible to development. The site can accommodate minimal change.

Low sensitivity: the site has few or no valued features, and/or valued features that are less susceptible to development and can accommodate change.

Is the site low, medium or high sensitivity in terms of visual amenity?

- **Low sensitivity:** the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.
- **Medium sensitivity:** the site is somewhat enclosed and has some intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it may adversely impact any identified views.
- **High sensitivity:** the site is visually open and has high intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would adversely impact any recognised views.

Low sensitivity: the site is visually enclosed and has low intervisibility with the surrounding landscape, and/or it would not adversely impact any identified views.

Heritage Constraints

2. Assessment of Suitability

<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation
<p>Would the development of the site cause harm to a non-designated heritage asset or its setting?</p> <p><i>Directly impact and/or mitigation not possible /</i> <i>Some impact, and/or mitigation possible /</i> <i>Limited or no impact or no requirement for mitigation</i></p>	Unknown
Planning Policy Constraints	
<p>Is the site in the Green Belt?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the site allocated for a particular use (e.g. housing / employment) or designated as open space in the adopted and / or emerging Local Plan?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Are there any other relevant planning policies relating to the site?</p>	Core Strategy Policy SD4 (Wastewater treatment and river water quality)
<p>Is the site:</p> <p><i>Greenfield / A mix of greenfield and previously developed land / Previously developed land</i></p>	Greenfield
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing built up area?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	Adjacent to and connected to the existing built up area
<p>Is the site within, adjacent to or outside the existing settlement boundary (if one exists)?</p> <p><i>Within / Adjacent to and connected to /</i> <i>Outside and not connected to</i></p>	N/A
<p>Would development of the site result in neighbouring settlements merging into one another?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No
<p>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</p> <p><i>Yes / No / Unknown</i></p>	No

3. Assessment of Availability

Is the site available for development?

Yes / No / Unknown

Yes

Are there any known legal or ownership problems such as unresolved multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies, or operational requirements of landowners?

Yes / No / Unknown

No

Is there a known time frame for availability?

Available now / 0-5 years / 6-10 years / 11-15 years

Unknown

4. Assessment of Viability

Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities? What evidence is available to support this judgement?

Yes / No / Unknown

Unknown

5. Conclusions

What is the expected development capacity of the site? (either as proposed by site promoter or estimated through SHLAA/HELAA or Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment)	N/A
What is the likely timeframe for development (0-5 / 6-10 / 11-15 / 15+ years)	Unknown
Other key information	N/A
Are there any known viability issues? <i>Yes / No</i>	Unknown
Overall rating (<i>Red/Amber/Green</i>) The site is <i>suitable and available</i> The site is <i>potentially suitable, and available</i> . The site is <i>not currently suitable, and available</i> .	Red: The site is not currently suitable, available and achievable
Summary of justification for rating	<p>This site was submitted to the 2015 Herefordshire SHLAA and was concluded to be unsuitable. It was not submitted to the Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites as has been assessed due to being in the public domain and in Pencombe.</p> <p>The site is unsuitable for the development proposed. This site is part traditional orchard, part greenfield land. The traditional orchard of this site has been designated as a Priority Habitat. This is no independent access to this site, only via the sewage works access which is gated. The site is isolated and enclosed as it is around by back of street fronting residential development and agricultural land. This site is also entirely comprised of high quality (Grade 2) agricultural land.</p> <p>There is no pedestrian footpath between the site and the village services, which may also render the site unsuitable for development, but this should be discussed with the Council's highways officers.</p> <p>Any development in Pencombe would have to demonstrate it would have no adverse effects on the integrity of the River Lugg Catchment Area as per Core Strategy Policy SD4.</p>