

Redditch Borough Council

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for Redditch Borough

March 2009

Deleted: October 2008

Contents

	Page No.
1. Introduction	1
2. Purpose of the SHLAA	1
3. West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)	2
4. The Current Housing Land Position	2
5. The SHLAA process	3
6. The SHLAA methodology	5 Deleted: 4
7. The SHLAA assessment	17 Deleted: 14
8. Conclusion	35 Deleted: 27
Appendix 1 Details of all bodies who were contacted on 1 February 2008 inviting them to contribute to the SHLAA partnership	
Appendix 2 Housing Site Suggestion form and consultation letter	
Appendix 3 Sites identified by White Young Green which may have development potential	
Appendix 4 Site Analysis form	
Appendix 5 Comments received on the draft Site Analysis form and any actions taken with respect to updating the form	
Appendix 6 Comments received on density multipliers and net developable areas and any actions taken with respect to updating the criteria	
Appendix 7 Windfall calculation	
Appendix 8 Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information	
Appendix 9 Assessment matrix of surveyed sites	

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The concept of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) is introduced in PPS3 - Housing (November 2006). They are seen as an important part of the policy process as they provide information on the opportunities that exist to meet the levels of need and demand for housing and in demonstrating a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 1.2 PPS3 sets out the key objectives which SHLAAs should meet and makes reference to practice guidance about detailed methodology for SHLAA production.
- 1.3 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments - Practice Guidance was published in July 2007 (hereafter referred to as the 'SHLAA guidance'. The recommended standard methodology prescribed in the SHLAA guidance has been followed for the production of this SHLAA for Redditch.
- 1.4 The SHLAA provides background evidence for the Borough of Redditch Core Strategy which is currently being produced and is at Preferred Draft stage. This is a technical report and is not a decision making document and does not allocate land for housing nor does it determine whether planning permission would be granted for residential development. It will indicate whether sufficient land is potentially available to meet the levels of growth proposed for Redditch Borough in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and provide evidence to support decision-making within the plan process. The SHLAA was prepared by Council officers and will be regularly monitored and reviewed as sites become available and are taken out of the "pool" of sites.

2. Purpose of the SHLAA

- 2.1 The primary role of the SHLAA is to:
 - identify sites with potential for housing;
 - assess their housing potential; and
 - assess when they are likely to be developed.
- 2.2 Specifically the SHLAA should:
 - identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development;
 - identify specific, deliverable sites for years 6 - 10, and ideally years 11 - 15, in plans to enable the five year supply to be topped up;

Deleted: October 2008

- where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11 - 15 of the plan, indicate broad locations for future growth.

3. West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

- 3.1 The RSS Preferred Option document consultation period ended on 8 December 2008 and its Examination in Public (EiP) will commence on 28 April 2009. It puts forward the following housing requirements for Redditch Borough between 2006 - 2026:

Deleted: is currently out for public

Deleted: until

Deleted: target

Table 1 - RSS Housing Proposals 2006 - 2026

Planning Area	Proposed Dwgs (Net)	Indicative Annual Average
Redditch *	6600 *	330

* Redditch figure of 6600 includes 3300 in Redditch Borough and 3300 adjacent to Redditch town in Bromsgrove and/or Stratford-on-Avon Districts.

- 3.2 Since the publication of the RSS Preferred Option document, additional work has been commissioned by the Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM) to assess the requirement for higher housing numbers based on revised government population projections, so the above requirement may change following the EiP. The results of this additional work are available in a study commissioned by GOWM and undertaken by planning consultants Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners.

Deleted: target

- 3.3 As a decision has not yet been made about the final RSS requirement for Redditch Borough, the SHLAA will deal solely with the 3300 dwelling requirement apportioned to be found within Redditch's administrative area in the RSS Preferred Option document.

Deleted: target

Deleted: target

4. The Current Housing Land Position

- 4.1 New land does not need to be identified for all 3300 dwellings. Housing completions since 1 April 2006, houses under construction, sites with planning permission and allocated land within adopted Local Plans contribute to the requirement. At 1 April 2008 the following commitments counted towards the RSS requirement of 3300 dwellings:

Deleted: and

Deleted: target

Deleted: target

Completions 2006 - 2008	-	690
Commitments *	-	521
		1211

* Allows a 12.7% lapse rate for small site commitments.

Deleted: October 2008

- 4.2 This means that Redditch Borough Council needs to identify enough land to address a shortfall of 2089 dwellings in order to meet its RSS requirement of 3300 dwellings, i.e. $3300 - 1211 = 2089$ dwellings.

Deleted: target

5. The SHLAA process

- 5.1 The methodology used for the SHLAA process is taken directly from the SHLAA guidance (July 2007). Para 15 of the SHLAA guidance states that the use of this standard methodology is strongly recommended because it will ensure that the Assessment findings are robust and transparently prepared.

- 5.2 Figure 1 of the Core requirements of the Assessment sets out the minimum core requirements which should be included in the SHLAA.

Figure 1: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment core outputs	
1	A list of sites, cross-referenced to maps showing locations and boundaries of specific sites (and showing broad locations where necessary)
2	Assessment of the delivery/ developability of each identified site (i.e. in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability) to determine when an identified site is realistically expected to be developed
3	Potential quantity of housing that could be delivered on each identified site or within each identified broad location (where necessary) or on windfall sites (where justified)
4	Constraints on the delivery of identified sites
5	Recommendations on how these constraints can be overcome and when

The core outputs have been dealt with in the following manner.

Core output	
1	Based on the Stage 3 Desktop review of 594 sites detailed at Appendix 8, only those sites considered suitable for further assessment (highlighted grey) have been mapped. 102 sites were assessed further and are detailed in Section 7 of this document. These sites have been split into two Technical Appendices for reporting purposes: <i>Appendix A: Sites considered as having development potential in the SHLAA</i> , and <i>Appendix B: Sites dropped from consideration in the SHLAA</i> .

Deleted: October 2008

Core output	
2	Technical Appendices A and B contain the completed site assessment forms which contribute to the overall site assessment. Appendix 9 of this report summarises the findings in a traffic light rated matrix.
3	Indicative layouts have been included in Technical Appendix A. The windfall assumption has been justified and calculated in Appendix 7 of this report.
4	Constraints to development forms part of the site assessment and is detailed in Technical Appendices A and B.
5	Overcoming constraints to development forms part of the site assessment and is detailed in Technical Appendices A and B. Following publication of the SHLAA, work will continue to address constraints with landowners (para 6.33).

5.2 Figure 2 of the ~~Core~~ requirements of the Assessment states that the assessment should involve key stakeholders including house builders, social landlords, local property agents and local communities plus other relevant agencies such as Housing Corporation and English Partnerships. The purpose of this involvement is to discuss and agree methods, assumptions, judgements and findings throughout the process to ensure the robustness and transparency of the Assessment. Appendix 1 details all bodies who were contacted on 1 February 2008 inviting them to contribute to the SHLAA partnership.

Deleted: core

5.3 Response from these bodies was extremely poor. There were no volunteers to contribute to a partnership panel; however, English Partnerships expressed a willingness to contribute via their agents as necessary. Despite this drawback, all bodies who submitted sites to be assessed through the SHLAA were contacted throughout the process for their input on matters such as density multipliers, site threshold sizes etc. Comments that were made and details of methodology consultation are addressed in the SHLAA methodology section of this report. All respondents were contacted throughout the process and this will continue for future SHLAA updates as appropriate.


5.4 This document ~~has already been~~ the subject of public consultation as part of the consultation process for the Draft Preferred Core Strategy and its suite of evidence based background documents ~~and this update will be inviting further comments until 8 May 2009~~. Comments received during the consultation process will be addressed and reported as an ongoing part of the SHLAA updates.

Deleted: will be

Deleted: October 2008

6. The SHLAA methodology

- 6.1 The SHLAA has eight main stages, with two further optional stages, covering broad locations and windfalls. The flowchart below is taken from the SHLAA guidance and illustrates the stages involved. Each of these is detailed in turn below with respect to the Redditch SHLAA.



Deleted: October 2008

Stage 1: Planning the Assessment

6.2 This Assessment only covers land within the administrative area of Redditch Borough. It is fully acknowledged that land will need to be identified beyond the Borough boundary and contiguous to it to accommodate Redditch's natural growth. Land in these locations was the subject of a separate study jointly commissioned by Redditch Borough Council, Bromsgrove District Council, Stratford-upon-Avon District Council, Worcestershire County Council and the Regional Assembly and carried out by White Young Green planning consultants in a document entitled *Study into the Future Growth Implications of Redditch – Second Stage Report*.

Deleted: SHLAA

6.3 As longer term housing growth for Redditch has implications for land beyond the administrative boundary, some initial site assessment planning was carried out with Bromsgrove District Council. Initial site suggestion forms were sent out around the same time and Officers jointly designed a site assessment form to be used by both districts for compatibility of data collation. The sites beyond Redditch's administrative boundary were assessed separately by White Young Green planning consultants as part of their Phase 2 report into Redditch's longer term growth options. These sites which were submitted to either Redditch Borough Council or Bromsgrove District Council through invitation to contribute to the SHLAA were forwarded to White Young Green and the landowners/ agents were notified accordingly.

Stage 2: Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment.

6.4 The SHLAA guidance (Figure 4) lists potential sources of sites which should be considered by local authorities; both sites in the planning process and sites not currently in the planning process. Many of the sites included in the SHLAA were already known to the local authority as they are current Local Plan sites or have been part of previous urban capacity studies, for example.

6.5 Sites included in the Assessment have been derived from the following sources:

- Existing housing requirements and unimplemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing and planning permissions for housing that is under construction at 1 April 2008.
- Sites identified in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 to address any shortfall in meeting current housing requirements.

Deleted: target

Deleted: October 2008

- Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 Omission Sites - sites suggested for inclusion in the Local Plan which were rejected by the Inspector for inclusion in the plan.
- Redditch Borough Council's Draft Preferred Core Strategy strategic sites.
- Sites in Redditch Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Documents (that are not strategic sites).
- Sites identified by White Young Green in their first report into future growth implications for Redditch (Dec 2007) – additional capacity within Redditch Borough.
- Sites identified by White Young Green in their second report into future growth implications for Redditch (Oct 2008) – assessment of surplus Primarily Open Space within Redditch.
- National Land Use Database sites within Redditch Borough.
- Submitted sites - A letter was sent to consultees on 1 February 2008, requesting initial information on any sites which could be assessed towards the SHLAA. Submitted sites are detailed in Appendix 8 along with contributor information in order for contributors to more easily 'audit trail' their sites. A Housing Site Suggestion form was attached to the letter, both of which are attached as Appendix 2. A full list of recipients is attached at Appendix 1.
- Redditch Borough Council land which may have the potential to be declared surplus for disposal.
- Redditch Urban Capacity Study (March 2003) Sites.

6.6 Sites in the following categories identified in the SHLAA guidance (Figure 4) have been excluded from the Assessment at this initial stage.

- Land allocated (or with permission) for employment or other land uses where the designation needs to be reviewed - Redditch has an increased employment land allocation target to meet under the emerging RSS, sites in this category will initially be assessed as part of the Employment Land Review (ELR). Including sites in the SHLAA at this stage which may have no housing potential is considered misleading. If included at this stage without prior assessment for

employment potential, it could subsequently be argued at appeal that these sites were considered suitable in principle for housing by virtue of their inclusion in the SHLAA. If any sites are surplus following the ELR, they will be investigated to establish whether they might contribute to the SHLAA at a later date.

- Land in non-residential use which may be suitable for re-development for housing, such as commercial buildings or car parks - as Redditch has emerging RSS requirements to meet for competing land uses such as retail, office and employment, including sites in the SHLAA at this stage which may have no housing potential is considered misleading. If included at this stage without prior assessment for other potential, it could subsequently be argued at appeal that these sites were considered suitable in principle for housing by virtue of their inclusion in the SHLAA. If any sites are surplus or offer a mixed use development as contribution to the Core Strategy, then their housing potential will be investigated at an appropriate time and included in the SHLAA at a later date if deemed necessary.
- Large scale redevelopment and re-design of existing residential areas - as Redditch is a new town, the age and layout of the majority of the town indicates that there are no existing residential areas which fall under this category.
- Urban extensions - these will be covered in the White Young Green Stage 2 report for growth options beyond Redditch's administrative boundary.
- New free standing settlements - the Phase II review of the RSS stipulates that longer term growth associated with Redditch should be adjacent to Redditch thus ruling out a free standing settlement.

6.7 The three Areas of Development Restraint within Redditch's administrative boundary have not been assessed by Redditch Borough Council in this SHLAA as they form part of the wider area of scope being assessed by White Young Green (Appendix 8, highlighted yellow). It was preferable for them to be assessed in the same manner as the large areas beyond Redditch's boundary for consistency with respect to suitability, availability and achievability. Consideration to net developable areas and density multipliers for housing having taken account of infrastructure provision and related ancillary facilities etc were also taken into account. Consequently, the ADRs at Brockhill, Webheath and A435 have been assessed by White Young Green as part of its Stage 2 report into the longer term growth options for Redditch.

The findings of the White Young Green report, with respect to the ADR assessments have been included in the Technical Appendices to this report. As the ADRs are within the Borough boundary, the White Young Green findings have been integrated within this report (para 7.12).

Deleted: show that they are less favourable housing options than Green Belt land in Bromsgrove District.

Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information

6.8 An initial desktop assessment of all sites identified from the various sources identified in Stage 2 has been carried out. Additional sources for sites were investigated as suggested in Figure 5 of the SHLAA guidance. However, sources such as the vacant property register only identified sites that fell below the minimum site threshold for this Assessment. Also at this stage, identified sites which were considered unsuitable for assessment were eliminated. Section 7 of this report gives details of the assessments.

6.9 With respect to site size, only sites that were over 0.16 Ha in size were considered, i.e. they are able to accommodate a minimum of 5 dwellings at a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. To identify sites below this threshold would mean attempting to identify sites of a scale down to individual housing plots. It was considered that this would be too onerous a task, extremely time consuming and potentially endless. Therefore any sites which fell below this threshold were not considered appropriate for the purposes of this study. However, it should be emphasised that the application of this threshold would not preclude smaller sites from coming forward for development. Such sites would be assessed on individual merit via the planning application process and, if suitable for development, would count towards the housing supply as windfall contributions. Windfall contributions are discussed at Stage 10 of this report.

Deleted: Any

Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed

6.10 To ensure a comprehensive assessment, all sites identified positively through the desk top review were surveyed, assessed and photographed. For reporting purposes, they have been split into two Technical Appendices: *Appendix A: Sites considered as having development potential in the SHLAA*, and *Appendix B: Sites dropped from consideration in the SHLAA*. As a cross-check mechanism to ensure that all sites which may have development potential were picked up for assessment in Stages 2 and 3, White Young Green Consultants, as part of its Phase 2 Study in to Redditch related growth, assessed amenity open spaces and semi natural open spaces. The amenity open space sites identified by White Young Green which were considered to have development potential are listed at Appendix 3 along with details of how

Deleted: October 2008

they were treated in the SHLAA. Of the semi natural open spaces assessed by White Young Green, 31 were considered as 'low' value from an ecology point of view. However, following review, White Young Green considered that none of these sites had any real development potential.

Stage 5: Carrying out the survey

- 6.11 SHLAA guidance states that as a minimum, all sites identified by the desktop review should be visited. A site analysis form was devised with Bromsgrove District Council in order to gather a consistent data set for all sites. The site analysis form is attached at Appendix 4. The assessment was split into three stages:
- 6.12 Stage A assessed initial suitability for further assessment and was a desktop assessment. In order for sites to be fully assessed, they had to be brownfield or greenfield sites within or adjoining a settlement within the Borough boundary. For the purposes of this survey, 'settlements' included Redditch urban area and Astwood Bank but excluded Feckenham. Any sites which were not within or adjoining a settlement were discounted, unless as in the case for Feckenham, a site provided 100% affordable housing.
- 6.13 Sites were also excluded at Stage A if they met any of the following criteria:
- Schedule Ancient Monument, located on the site;
 - Significant adverse impact on biodiversity*;
 - Site falls within Flood Zone 3*.
- * These sites may be reassessed at a later date under SHLAA review if landowners can demonstrate that mitigation measures can be successfully introduced.
- 6.14 Stage B gathered information relating to the sites e.g. environmental issues, sustainability, constraints to delivery and highway access amongst others and was given a traffic light rating. An amber or red rating would not preclude a site from development, rather it gives an indication of which sites may be capable of earlier release for development due to fewer constraints. The traffic light assessment is detailed in a matrix at Appendix 9.
- 6.15 A letter was sent to all parties who submitted sites for assessment inviting comments on the draft Site Analysis form. Appendix 5 details the comments received and any actions taken with respect to updating the form.

6.16 Stage C sets out housing potential, availability and achievability of sites and is discussed in the subsequent methodology stages. Section 7 of this report details which assessed sites are considered to have development potential.

Deleted: details

Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site

6.17 SHLAA guidance suggests that the housing potential of an identified site should be guided by existing or emerging plan policy. PPS3 states that 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) should be used as a national indicative minimum until local density policies are in place. The Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 Density of Housing policy indicates that development should take place between 30-50 dph except in the town centre where densities of 70 dph should be achieved. Further to this, SHLAA guidance suggests that the capacities of sites should be guided by local level housing densities but where these do not provide a sufficient basis to make a local judgement, one approach to estimating potential is by sketching a scheme. Although Redditch Borough Council considers its Housing Density policy to provide a sufficient basis to make a local judgement, schemes have been sketched for sites not currently in the planning system to further aid estimation of site yield.

6.18 The letter detailed in Appendix 5 also invited comments on density multipliers and net developable areas. Appendix 6 details comments received and any actions taken with respect to updating the criteria.

6.19 Density multipliers have been used to gauge a ball-park figure to guide progression of RSS responses and production of the draft Preferred Core Strategy for Redditch. They have been set out as a lower and upper figure based on 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) in urban areas and a minimum of 70 dph with the Town Centre and District Centres (based on Local Plan No.3 Policy B(HSG).4 – Density of Housing Development). These levels are also being progressed in the emerging Core Strategy. Net developable areas allow for infrastructure provision on sites. As such, the following net developable area criteria have been used with the density multipliers to establish initial potential housing figures:

Deleted: For the purposes of this first draft of the SHLAA report,

Deleted: (see paragraph 6.21)

- Sites up to 0.4 Ha - 100% of site area to be used.
- Sites 0.4 Ha to 2 Ha - 85% of site area to be used.
- Sites 2 Ha and over - 65% of site area to be used.

Deleted: At a later date, it is anticipated that sites will be further assessed by an urban designer who will produce indicative schemes taking account of site constraints, surrounding densities etc.

6.20 As part of this update, sites considered to have development potential have been further assessed by an urban designer who has produced indicative

Deleted: October 2008

schemes taking account of site constraints, surrounding densities etc. The indicative schemes have been incorporated in Technical Appendix A.

- 6.21 Of the sites considered to have development potential, the capacity ranges have been detailed in Section 7 of this report.

Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed

- 6.22 Assessing the suitability, availability and achievability of a site provides the information on which the judgement can be made in the plan making context as to whether a site can be considered deliverable, developable or not currently developable for housing.

- 6.23 In order for a site to be considered as deliverable it must be available now, in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect of delivery within five years.

- 6.24 In order for a site to be considered as developable it must be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that it will be available and could be developed at a specific point in time.

Stage 7a: Assessing suitability for housing

- 6.25 A site is suitable if it offers a suitable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable mixed communities.

- 6.26 Some sites which have received a positive assessment through the Stage A criteria may still not be suitable to continue to further assessment at Stages B and C. Examples include: (i) excess land within a previously identified site which has been developed was retained by the Scouts and Cadets and is now a well maintained HQ for these groups and relocation would be inappropriate; (ii) areas of open space may provide essential amenity facilities in densely populated areas.

- 6.27 Section 7 of this report details the assessed sites and their suitability to contribute towards housing provision. Although some sites may indeed have scored positively in the Stage B criteria, local knowledge and a visual assessment of the sites and their surroundings has also been taken into account. A considered judgement has been taken as to whether development would compromise the townscape and visual amenity of the area and thus, some sites have been discounted if development was considered wholly inappropriate. These sites are detailed in Section 7 of this report.

Deleted: Initially, density multipliers have been set out as a lower and upper figure based on 30 - 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) in urban areas and a minimum of 70 dph with the Town Centre and District Centres.

Deleted: Net developable areas allow for infrastructure provision on sites. As such, the following net developable area criteria have been used with the density multipliers to establish initial potential housing figures:

¶ Sites up to 0.4 Ha - 100% of site area to be used.

¶ Sites 0.4 Ha to 2 Ha - 85% of site area to be used.

¶ Sites 2 Ha and over - 65% of site area to be used.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 1.27 cm

Deleted: The site analysis gives very basic figures for the amount of potential housing land. However, in addition to these figures, the SHLAA needs to consider whether sites are suitable and available for development and if so, the achievability of development.

Deleted: s

Deleted: developable

Deleted: they

Deleted: :

Deleted: 24

Deleted: For

Deleted: e

Deleted: ,

Deleted: part of

Deleted: 25

Deleted: October 2008

Deleted: October 2008

Stage 7b: Assessing availability for housing

6.28 A site is considered **available** when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. This means that the site is controlled by a housing developer or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell.

Deleted: 26

6.29 For those sites that have been submitted for assessment by landowners, an assumption ~~has been~~ made about ~~those~~ landowners' attitudes towards development. These sites can be considered to be available for development as the landowners are clearly proactively considering the future development of their sites. Where ownership information ~~was~~ not available, landowners' attitudes towards development ~~were~~ more difficult to determine. Land Registry searches for information on land ownership ~~were only~~ carried out for sites that are considered to offer some development potential. At this point, these landowners were contacted to establish their attitudes towards development of their sites. The costs associated with Land Registry enquiries on all surveyed sites, including those which were discounted, would have been prohibitive for the Council.

Deleted: s

Deleted: can be

Deleted: the

Deleted: is

Deleted: will be

Deleted: at this stage

Deleted: Although enquiries can be made to the Land Registry for information on land ownership, the costs of enquiring on all surveyed sites may be prohibitive. The view has therefore been taken that

Deleted: will only be

Deleted: This information was not available for this first draft of the SHLAA report but will be included at a later date at the same time as indicative layouts are included.

Deleted: 27

Stage 7c: Assessing achievability for housing

6.30 A site is considered **achievable** when there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about economic viability of a site and the ability of the developer to complete the housing over a particular time period.

Achievability will be affected by:

- Market factors;
- Cost factors; and
- Delivery factors.

6.31 Given the current housing climate and the ~~continuing economic downturn~~, it was decided that only a negative conclusion could be drawn at ~~the present time~~ with respect to achievability based on the above contributing factors. ~~PPS3 states that SHLAAs should identify specific sites for at least 15 years from DPD adoption. In the case of Redditch Borough Council, this is currently anticipated to be mid 2010. The Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners Report (Oct. 2008) considers the housing supply range identified by the Housing and Planning Advice Unit which, in its supply trajectory (figure 8.1), shows supply~~

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 1.21 cm

Deleted: escalating 'credit crunch'

Deleted: this stage

Deleted: . Therefore, at this point in time,

Deleted: October 2008

trajectories adjusted for the market downturn. Figure 8.1 suggests that during 2010/11 there will be an upturn in the housing market. As part of the Core Strategy evidence base, communication with all major service/ utility providers indicates that there are no long term barriers to achieving development. With this in mind, and the knowledge that some sites already under construction within Redditch have recently been 'moth-balled', delivery assumptions have been gauged based on the emerging Draft Preferred Core Strategy policy for phasing of new residential development which states that '*Development will be favoured which is phased accordingly as follows:*

i) urban brownfield sites, including brownfield strategic sites or strategic sites that include a greenfield element, followed by;

ii) urban greenfield sites including greenfield strategic sites.'

- 6.32 Thereby, using the assumption that through phasing policies, urban sites should be both available and achievable at an earlier stage in the plan period. Redditch Borough Council will endeavour to supplement these assumptions through discussion with landowners when the SHLAA is refreshed annually in April. As the SHLAA is a living document, it is anticipated that the status of sites will continue to alter on an annual basis.

Stage 7d: Overcoming constraints

- 6.33 With respect to overcoming possible constraints on sites, Redditch Borough Council considers that investigation, mitigation and investment should be the responsibility of the landowner if they wish to progress their site towards development. However, Redditch Borough Council will contact landowners of potential development sites with possible constraints to proactively discuss appropriate courses of action. If landowners are not willing to investigate remedies to overcome constraints then these sites will be dropped to the lower end of the achievability/ deliverability rating as this would be perceived as an unwillingness to develop the site (Stage 7b). Through discussions with landowners, sites will move up the achievability/ deliverability rating in future SHLAA updates when constraints have been satisfactorily addressed.

Deleted: 28

Deleted: Once ownership has been established,

Deleted: establish future

Deleted: and monitored through SHLAA updates.

Stage 8: Review of the assessment

- 6.34 The SHLAA will be reviewed annually and updated to 1 April each year in line with other housing land monitoring and it is anticipated that consultation with interested parties, in the absence of a Stakeholder Panel, will continue.

Deleted: 29

Deleted: October 2008

Stage 9: Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations (where necessary)

- 6.35 As stated earlier in this report, it is fully acknowledged that land will need to be identified beyond the Borough boundary and contiguous to it, to accommodate Redditch's natural growth. Land in these locations is the subject of a separate study jointly commissioned by Redditch Borough Council, Bromsgrove District Council, Stratford-on-Avon District Council, Worcestershire County Council and the Regional Assembly and carried out by White Young Green planning consultants.

Deleted: 30

Deleted: SHLAA

Deleted: up

Stage 10: Determining the housing potential of windfall (where justified)

- 6.36 The SHLAA guidance indicates that there may be genuine local circumstances where a windfall allowance may be justified. Section 7 of this Assessment indicates that insufficient land has been identified through the SHLAA process for Redditch Borough Council to meet the portion of its housing requirement of 3300 dwellings within its administrative boundary. As Redditch's longer term growth relies heavily on Green Belt development beyond its administrative boundary, it is considered appropriate that windfall development which may occur within the urban area is justification for its inclusion in the SHLAA.

Deleted: 31

Deleted: Historically, Redditch Borough has seen a consistent level of contribution to housing targets come through windfall planning consents and there is no reason why these should not continue to come forward in the future.

Deleted: should be accounted for

- 6.37 A site size threshold for this Assessment was set at sites over 0.16 Ha in size or capable of accommodating 5 dwellings or more. To identify sites below this threshold would mean attempting to identify sites of a scale down to individual housing plots. It was considered that this would be too onerous a task, extremely time consuming and potentially endless. Therefore it is considered appropriate and justified to include a figure for windfall provision on small sites within the urban area to contribute towards the shortfall of meeting the 3300 dwelling requirement within Redditch's administrative area.

- 6.38 As the site threshold for small site windfall dwellings is effectively 4 dwellings or less, it is more than likely that the majority of these will arise from house conversions to flats or intensification of existing residential plots. As such, they will be classed as brownfield contributions.

Deleted: 32

Deleted: in the SHLAA

- 6.39 For the purposes of establishing a windfall calculation for the SHLAA, an annual average of all small site brownfield completions on sites of less than 5 dwellings has been calculated and is detailed in Appendix 7. It is considered that many of the windfall completions coming forward in the next three years will already be identified as small sites commitments (i.e. sites with planning permission). Therefore, to provide a windfall figure within this three year period may result in double counting. However, in the period after 2011, the stock of

Deleted: 33

Deleted: multiplied by 18 (number of years remaining in the plan period) and

Deleted: October 2008

sites with existing consent will be depleted and therefore the provision of an allowance for small site windfalls coming forward after this time is considered wholly appropriate for Redditch.

6.40 It is fully acknowledged that the current housing climate referred to in paragraph 6.30 could indeed affect small scale development such as that established through a windfall assessment. The trend based annual average assumption used in Appendix 7, covers a 12 year period and is based on brownfield completions of less than 5 dwellings within the urban area of Redditch only. It is considered that the data in this time period reflects the 'peaks' and 'troughs' in the development market and provides a realistic assumption of anticipated small site provision. This calculation will be revisited annually as part of the SHLAA update.

Deleted: 34

Deleted: 28

Deleted: October 2008

7. The SHLAA assessment

7.1 594 sites were drawn from the various sources identified in Stage 2 and initially **desktop** assessed for their suitability to be carried forward for detailed assessment. They are detailed at Appendix 8. At this stage, some sites were eliminated for the following reasons:

- Below site size threshold
- Duplicated across more than one source
- Already developed
- To be assessed by the Employment Land Review (**ELR**) in the first instance
- Sites more suitable for mixed uses
- Other uses for the site imminent
- ADR land to be assessed by White Young Green
- SSSI/ SWS/ LNR
- Allotments
- Open space in Wards with limited open space
- Highway issues
- Sports facilities
- Buffers between incompatible land uses
- Balancing areas
- High landscape value
- Heavily wooded semi-natural open space
- Within flood zone
- Scheduled Ancient Monument
- Compromise Arrow Valley Park
- Biodiversity issues
- Play areas

7.2 Of the 594 sites, 107 were considered suitable to be assessed in greater detail. Where sites were adjacent to each other, and it was considered that they should be assessed jointly for comprehensive development, they were merged into one site.

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Merged sites	Justification for merging sites
LPX01	Rear of 1-11 Auxerre Avenue	Site merged with UCS 8.38	WCC & RBC preference to jointly promote merged site
LPX05	Land at Fire Station & Millfields	Site merged with WYG05	WCC & RBC preference to jointly promote merged site

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Merged sites	Justification for merging sites
RB07	RO 128-146 Bromsgrove Road	Merged with RB03 for assessment	Multiple landowners (private) with preference to jointly promote merged site via agents
RB38	102-110 Bromsgrove Road	Merged with RB03 for assessment	Multiple landowners (private) with preference to jointly promote merged site via agents
UCS 3.24	Land of Hunt End Lane	Merged with UCS 3.23	2 no. adjacent RBC owned land parcels identified in UCS (1997). Merged for comprehensive assessment of sites
UCS 4.22	Marlfield Farm playing field	Merged with WYG04 for assessment	2 no. sites previously identified separately now under one ownership (private)
UCS 8.37	Land fronting Greenlands Drive	Merged with UCS 8.15	3 no. adjacent RBC owned land parcels identified in UCS (1997). Merged for comprehensive assessment of sites
UCS 8.40	Land fronting Woodrow North	Merged with UCS 8.15	3 no. adjacent RBC owned land parcels identified in UCS (1997). Merged for comprehensive assessment of sites

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Merged sites	Justification for merging sites
UCS 8.41	Land opposite Bushley Close	Merged with UCS 8.15	3 no. adjacent RBC owned land parcels identified in UCS (1997). Merged for comprehensive assessment of sites
UCS 8.46	Land at 'McDonalds' Island	Site merged with UCS 8.10 and part of UCS 8.47	3 no. adjacent RBC owned land parcels identified in UCS (1997). Merged for comprehensive assessment of sites

7.3 Of the sites considered suitable for assessment, the following were dropped at Stage A of the assessment:

Deleted: 99

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
WYG01	Hewell Road Baths	Within flood zone
L4L03	Land at Loxley Close	Within flood zone
RB01	Windmill Cottage, Callow Hill Lane	Land within Callow Hill Ridge Area
RB08	Land at Astwood Lane, Astwood Bank	Site not adjacent to or within an existing settlement
RB12	Land north of Love Lyne	Land within Callow Hill Ridge Area
RB24	The White House, Astwood Lane	Site not adjacent or within an existing settlement
RB29	Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Site not adjacent or within an existing settlement
RB30	Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Site not adjacent or within an existing settlement
RB31	Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Site not adjacent or within an existing settlement
UCS 1.20	Land rear of Batchley shops	Within flood zone
UCS 1.55	Land to the side of Batchley Road shops (site merged with site 1.20: land rear of Batchley Road shops)	Within flood zone
UCS 4.2	Land southwest of Meadow Farm P.H	Within flood zone

Deleted: LPX05

... [1]

Deleted: WYG05

... [2]

Deleted: October 2008

- 7.4 In addition to the sites which did not meet the Stage A criteria, sites within Redditch's Green Belt but which were adjacent to a settlement boundary were also excluded at this stage in light of the emerging Green Belt Study which listed compelling reasons against Green Belt development within Redditch's administrative area. The following sites were dropped for this reason:

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
RB06	Land between Tookeys Farmhouse and Doebank House, Astwood Bank	Green Belt – refer to Green Belt Study
RB10	East of Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross	Redditch Green Belt and Special Wildlife Site
RB11	Land south of the Slough and east of Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross	Redditch Green Belt land. In the midst of one of the busiest traffic islands in Redditch (Crabbs Cross junction), this site is a tranquil haven for wildlife. The site is almost 2ha in size and accessibility would be a major issue into and out of this site based on the traffic numbers that would be generated by the level of development that could be accommodated
RB22	Land off Gorsey Close, Astwood Bank	Green Belt – refer to Green Belt Study
RB36	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Green Belt land – see Green Belt Study. Additional traffic in the vicinity could not be accommodated by Green Lane or its junction with Crumpfields Lane. Upgrading the lane would destroy the rural character of the area

- 7.5 Three sites within or close to the Town Centre were also excluded from the study at initial assessment and Stage A as it was considered that at this stage in the Draft Preferred Core Strategy production, they may fulfil a need for mixed use sites including housing, retail and B1 office uses. At this point in time, in the absence of detailed feasibility studies, it was considered inappropriate to identify a figure for housing. It is anticipated that these sites will re-establish themselves in the SHLAA following future updates when supporting evidence becomes available.

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
LPX03	Prospect Hill	As RSS has given Redditch increased requirements for town centre office and retail needs, this site has the potential for a range of uses. Until further investigation can be carried out to explore all possible uses of this site, it would be remiss to identify it solely for housing at this stage in the SHLAA
	Edward Street	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
	Church Road	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date

Deleted: target

Deleted: allocate

Deleted: October 2008

- 7.6 Two district centre sites were dropped at Stage A of the assessment and are detailed below:

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
CS02	Winyates District Centre	Although this Centre would benefit from regeneration, it can not be relied upon that the quantity of dwellings would increase due to numbers of existing residential units within the Centre if regeneration was to take place
CS04	Woodrow District Centre	Although this Centre would benefit from regeneration, it can not be relied upon that the quantity of dwellings would increase due to numbers of existing residential units within the Centre if regeneration was to take place

- 7.7 The remaining sites, with the exception of current Local Plan commitments and other sites with planning permission were subject to Stage B site analysis. Whilst assessing sites, it became clear that although some sites would score well on the Stage B criteria and appeared suitable for development based on the criteria alone, development of the site would be wholly inappropriate. The following sites were discounted and were therefore not fully assessed under Stage B:

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
RB13	Land off Dagnell End Road	Within Arrow Valley Park. Residential development is considered inappropriate in this location as no other residential development exists for development of this site to be considered as a natural extension to it
RB14	Driving range, Dagnell End Road	Within Arrow Valley Park. Existing residential development wraps around the golf course facilities, development here would intrude beyond the natural boundary formed by the housing to the golf course. Site suffers with drainage issues

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
RB15	Land off Rush Lane	Development would intrude into the Arrow Valley Park beyond the natural boundary formed by existing residential development
RB34	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Area of open space softens the transition from built up urban area to Green Belt, therefore development is considered inappropriate. Additional traffic in the vicinity could not be accommodated by Green Lane or its junction with Crumpfields Lane. Upgrading the lane would destroy the rural character of the area
RB35	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Area of open space softens the transition from built up urban area to Green Belt, therefore development is considered inappropriate. Additional traffic in the vicinity could not be accommodated by Green Lane or its junction with Crumpfields Lane. Upgrading the lane would destroy the rural character of the area
RB37	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Area of open space softens the transition from built up urban area to Green Belt, therefore development is considered inappropriate. Additional traffic in the vicinity could not be accommodated by Green Lane or its junction with Crumpfields Lane. Upgrading the lane would destroy the rural character of the area
UCS 1.9	Land at Torrs Close	Heavily wooded highway verge
UCS 1.11	Land at Ashperton Close	Although site is above the site size threshold, it would be inappropriate within the street scene to develop this site at minimum density of 30dph. It is considered that 2 to 3 units would be more acceptable on this site and development would therefore be more appropriate as windfall

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
UCS 1.16	Land at western end of Salters Lane	This open space has long been associated with the setting of the surrounding residential development and is distinctive to the character of the area.
UCS 1.44	Corner of Cherry Tree Walk and Foxlydiate Crescent	Area of flat, maintained open land in an area with very little amenity open space
UCS 1.50	Land rear of Bromsgrove Road – industrial buildings	Access Issues. Highways suggest that possibly 4 dwellings could be served off what would be classed as a private driveway. As such, this site falls below the minimum dwelling yield threshold of this study.
UCS 1.54	The Brockhill P.H.	Public House – well used. No indication that it may close
UCS 2.15	Land off Springvale Road	Loss of well used play area. Very little play space available in this vicinity
UCS 2.18	Land off Boxnott Close	Site land locked for access. Well used play space
UCS 3.3	Rear of The Archers P.H., Feckenham Road	Cadet HQ and Scout Hut
UCS 3.21	Land between Windmill Drive and Love Lyne / Tippings Hill	Site has a high visual prominence within the landscape and is adjacent to part of the Callow Hill Ridge Area. Site slopes steeply away to the north, east and south. Flattest part of site is at its highest and has uninterrupted views to the Malvern Hills
UCS 3.22	Land off Hunt End Lane	Existing development which is in close proximity to Windmill Drive is well screened from the highway by mature trees and hedgerow planting. Development of this site would be open to the highway and out of character with the surrounding area
UCS 3.27	Land rear of Peterbrook Close	Oakenshaw Park – high, prominent point in surrounding landscape. Development at this height would compromise character of surrounding area

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
UCS 3.49	Car park / bottle bank	Site provides an important off-street car parking provision
UCS 4.1	Land north of Meadow Farm P.H.	Within Arrow Valley Park. This area prone to flash flooding. Also, residential development inappropriate in this location as no other residential development exists for development of this site to be considered as a natural extension to it.
UCS 4.6	Land north of Dolphin Road, south of Church Hill Way	This area prone to frequent flash flooding
UCS 4.36(b)	Land south of Brooklands Lane	Within Arrow Valley Park. Site very isolated from nearby development. Well screened from highway by double hedgerow and bunding. Rural feel to the site would be compromised by development and would be out of character with its immediate surroundings
UCS 6.7	Land off Holloway Drive and Huins Close	No access to site possible
UCS 6.10	Land between Sandon Close and Holloway Drive	Access issues – Sandon Close unable to take additional traffic capacity due to street width.
UCS 6.37	Rear of Sillins Avenue	Access issues – Sandon Close unable to take additional traffic capacity due to street width.
UCS 6.40	Land at St. Bedes RC School	No access
UCS 7.2	Land adjacent to Foxcote Close (land within bdy of LP63)	Site offers valuable amenity play space close to an area of high density housing.
UCS 8.2	Land off Green Lane	Site adjacent low density ribbon development on the very outskirts of the urban area. Access could be an issue as site very close to existing junction. Development of this site is considered inappropriate
UCS 8.9	Land north of Fladbury Close, Woodrow	Steep grassed 'gateway' into the estate. Height of site would provide overbearing development with respect to adjacent houses

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
UCS 8.12	Land off Wharrington Hill, Greenlands	Site is steep and offers pedestrian access through the estate. Development considered inappropriate in terms of visual scale and accessibility
UCS 8.15	Land between Woodrow and Greenlands	Important parkland in an area of very high density housing
UCS 8.47	Land at 'McDonalds' Island	Part of site merged with UCS 8.46 and part of UCS 8.47. Remainder assessed independently. Balancing area. Whole site marshy underfoot with marsh grass present. Drainage channel looks as though it breaches its walls by sediment on surrounding grass and sides of channel. This site would need detailed flood risk investigation before consideration for housing
UCS 9.3	Land fronting Warwick Highway (Road Reserve)	Access from Warwick Highway would be undesirable. Development beyond the natural planting rear of Glebe Close would be out of keeping with the natural boundary of the existing residential estate
UCS 9.9	Land fronting Millhill Road	Amenity open space in an area with few play spaces
UCS 12.1	Land opposite Foredrift Close	Unlikely to achieve satisfactory access

Deleted: October 2008

7.8 The following sites have been discounted at indicative scheme stage. The urban designer carrying out the schemes expressed concern about their suitability for development.

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
UCS 3.42	Land south of Walkwood School playing field	Recent work to install additional sewage network leaves unsuitable for residential development
UCS 8.21	Land at Wirehill	<u>Boundary access unrealistic due to the nature of steep slopes. This site will be reassessed in April 2009, taking account of additional Highways Authority advice.</u>

Formatted: Font: Arial Narrow

7.9 The following site was dropped during this update as it failed to gain planning consent at Committee and is required for open space uses.

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Reason for dropping site
L4L04	Land at Skilts Avenue	Required for open space use

7.10 A matrix of all site assessments is available at Appendix 9.

Deleted: 8

Deleted: October 2008

7.11 This assessment process has identified 43 sites below which are considered suitable for residential development and should count towards the SHLAA. A matrix of their assessment is available at Appendix 9. All sites which are considered suitable for inclusion in the SHLAA have been apportioned a capacity figure based on 30 dph and 50dph, taking into account the criteria in paragraph 6.19 this report. They have also been the subject of indicative schemes, produced by independent urban designers to ascertain appropriate and achievable capacities in line with the SHLAA Practice Guidance.

Deleted: 9

Local Plan Commitments

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity	Comments
LP01	Old Crest, Smallwood (LP 83)	21	Valid planning consent (B) ¹
LP02	Brush Factory, Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross (LP124)	10	Under construction (B)
LP03	Rear of 144-162 Easemore Road (LP135)	24	Valid planning consent (B)
LP04	Land at former Mega Bowl site (LP140)	89	Under construction (B)
LP05	Windsor Gas Works (LP147)	255	Valid planning consent (B)
LP06	Mayfields Works (06/187)	18	Valid planning consent (B)
LP07	Johnsons Cars, Clive Road (06/247)	24	Valid planning consent (B)
LP08	Grange Works (06/494)	22	Under construction (B)
LP09	Adjacent Rockhill Farm (07/005)	10	Under construction (G)
LP10	Walton Close (07/275)	19	Valid planning consent (B)
LP11	Community House, Easemore Road (05/301ol)	6	Valid planning consent (B)
LP12	1184-6 Evesham Road, Astwood Bank (05/480)	9	Under construction (B)
LP13	Land off Torrs Close (06/371)	6	Under construction (B)
LP15	Adjacent The Lodge, Pool Bank (07/201)	5	Under construction (B)
LP16	Land at Tidbury Close (07/214)	6	Valid planning consent (G)
Sub Total		524	

¹ Refers to Brownfield (B) or Greenfield (G) nature of site

Deleted: Greenfield

Deleted: October 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity			Comments
		30 dph	50 dph	Scheme	
LPX02	Adjacent Castleditch Lane / Pheasant Lane	13	22	16	(G)
LPX04	Former Claybrook School, Matchborough	19	32	36	(B & G)
LPX05	Land at Millfields, Fire Station and RO Fire Station	35	58	35	In the initial draft, this site was identified as being within the floodzone. Confirmation has been received stating that the floodzone information relating to this site is incorrect and the site has now been included (B)
LPX06	Former Ipsley School playing field	24	40	31	(G)
LPX07	South of scout hut, Oakenshaw Road	26	44	32	(G)
Sub Total		117	196	150	

Planning Permissions granted after 1 April 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity	Comments
PP01	Red Lion PH, Church Road, Astwood Bank	5	Valid planning consent (B)
Sub Total		5	

Draft Preferred Core Strategy Strategic Sites

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity	Comments
CS01	Church Hill District Centre	57	Although this Centre would benefit from regeneration is difficult to estimate the level of housing that could be accommodated without a detailed indicative scheme. Therefore the WYG estimate has been used for the purposes of this exercise (B)
CS03	Matchborough District Centre	17	Although this Centre would benefit from regeneration is difficult to estimate the level of housing that could be accommodated without a detailed indicative scheme. No decision by the Council has been taken at this stage with respect to its suitability for redevelopment including a housing element. Therefore the WYG stage 1 report estimate has been used for the purposes of this exercise (B)
Sub Total		74	

White Young Green Joint Study Sites

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity			Comments
		30 dph	50 dph	Scheme	
WYG02	Peterbrook Close	5	8	6	Planning application pending (G)
WYG03	Tanhouse Lane	14	24	22	(B)
WYG04	Marfield Farm School	36	60	53	(B & G)
WYG06	High Trees, Dark Lane	5	5	5	(B)
Sub Total		60	97	86	

Deleted: October 2008

Submitted Sites

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity			Comments
		30 dph	50 dph	Scheme	
RB03	Widney House, Bromsgrove Road	45	75	58	Includes RB07 & RB 38 for assessment (B)
Sub Total		45	75	58	

Assets Disposal Sites

Deleted: Land 4 Leisure

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity			Comments
		30 dph	50 dph	Scheme	
L4L01	Land off Banners Lane	5	5	5	Scheme being progressed for release of land (G)
L4L02	Land off Wirehill Drive	12	20	13	Scheme being progressed for release of land (G)
Sub Total		17	25	18	

Deleted: October 2008

Urban Capacity Study

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity			Comments
		30 dph	50 dph	Scheme	
UCS 1.35	Rear of Poplar Road shops	8	13	18	Site boundary altered following survey (B)
UCS 2.14	Land adjacent Saltways Cheshire Home	5	5	5	Planning consent (B)
UCS 2.16	Rear of Sandygate Close	6	10	8	(G)
UCS 3.10	Land off Priestfield Road	8	13	4	(B)
UCS 3.23	Land off Hunt End Lane	42	70	22	Some scope for development but buffer between incompatible uses would need to be maintained (G)
UCS 3.43	Land east of Longfellow Close	9	15	7	Site boundary altered after survey (G)
UCS 4.36	Land between Brooklands Lane and Offenham Close	40	57	47	(G)
UCS 5.20	Land off Lady Harriet's Lane	10	10	7	Access issue if developed at minimum density or above (G)
UCS 8.10	Land opposite Kempsford Close, Oakenshaw South	60	99	44	Site merged with UCS 8.46 and part of UCS 8.47 (G)
UCS 8.38	Dingleside Middle School & playing field and land rear of 1-11 Auxerre Avenue	77	129	120	Merged with LPX01 (B & G)
UCS 9.1	Land rear of Watery Lane / Ravensmere Close	17	29	16	Site boundary altered following survey (G)
Sub Total		282	450	298	

Deleted: UCS 3.42

... [3]

Deleted: October 2008

7.11 As stated in paragraph 6.29 of this report, it was considered inappropriate to seek Land Registry information for all identified sites and this has been left until all sites with development potential have been identified. Landowners have been contacted for additional site information and this has been included, where possible in the Appendix 9 matrix. Where information regarding landowners willingness to progress sites remains sketchy, Redditch Borough Council has made the assumption that as all the sites are in the urban area, they would be suitable for development in the early phasing of the plan period. Redditch Borough Council will endeavour to update information on the willingness of landowners to progress their sites towards development and this information will form part of the annual updates of the SHLAA report.

Deleted: 7.10 . At this stage, all sites which are considered suitable for inclusion in the SHLAA have been apportioned a capacity figure based on 30 dph, taking into account the criteria in paragraphs 6.19 and 6.20 of this report. These sites will now be the subject of indicative schemes, produced by independent urban designers to ascertain appropriate and achievable capacities in line with the SHLAA Practice Guidance. The results of this will form the first update of the SHLAA report.

Deleted: 24

7.12 As stated at paragraph 6.7, the three ADRs in Redditch were assessed by White Young Green as part of its Stage 2 report into the longer term growth options for Redditch, the findings of which appear in the table below. Full details of these findings are available in the White Young Green Stage 2 report.

Deleted: This does mean that at this point in time, there is some uncertainty as to the willingness of unknown landowners to progress identified sites to development. At this stage, an assumption has been made, that

Deleted: Ownership details and

Deleted: will be established

Deleted: also

Deleted: first

Deleted: have been

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 0

Site	Residential Capacity
A435 ADR	598
Brockhill ADR	308
Webheath ADR	450
Total	1356

7.13 However, White Young Green draws the following conclusions with respect to the ADRs in the context of its wider assessment of the suitability of land around Redditch's urban area to accommodate the RSS housing requirement:



7 RECOMMENDATION

7.09 In our view the Webheath ADR is not suitable for development due to the poor linkages with the town centre and employment areas, the quality and character of the landscape, the restricted highways network and difficulties in providing foul drainage.

Deleted: October 2008

7.10 We are also of the opinion that the A435 ADR and non-Green Belt land within Stratford-on-Avon District are peripheral to Redditch and could not be considered as sustainable locations for development. Any major development in this area would have significant impacts on the character and appearance of this Eastern Fringe and bring about the merging of Redditch and Mappleborough Green which we regard as being harmful.

7.11 Whilst the Brockhill ADR west of the railway could be regarded as a sustainable location given its proximity to the town centre the site is compromised due to its topography and relationship to the adjoining countryside. The site also has a limited capacity of 308 dwellings based on the North West Redditch masterplan. There is capacity at Bordesley Park to accommodate either growth option and if our recommendation were to be adopted there would be no need to consider additional urban expansion sites within the plan period up to 2026 at the earliest.

7.12 For these reasons we recommend that these three sites currently designated as ADRs within the Redditch Local Plan along with that area of land between the A435 ADR and the A435 in Stratford-on-Avon District are added to the Green Belt. The areas are detailed below.

Brockhill ADR (west of the railway)	17.5 ha
Webheath ADR	47.3 ha
A435 ADR	32.4 ha
Land to west of A435 in Stratford-on-Avon	14.8 ha
Total	112 ha

7.13 In our opinion the addition of these sites would strengthen the Green Belt around Redditch and, in particular, the safeguarding of the slopes at Brockhill and maintaining the screen between the A435 and Redditch will be highly beneficial in restricting the appearance of urban sprawl.

7.13 Therefore, based on the above, Redditch Borough Council concludes that the three ADRs are not 'suitable' for development and is allowing no capacity on the three ADRs in the SHLAA.

Deleted: October 2008

8. Conclusion

8.1 This document provides a snapshot of both commitments (with a base date of 1 April 2008) and potential additional supply within the Borough of Redditch. The SHLAA will inform the preparation of the Redditch Core Strategy and provide evidence to support decision making within the plan process.

Deleted: with a base date of 1 April 2008

Deleted: demonstrates a 5 year supply of housing land and

8.2 The SHLAA has been carried out in accordance with the SHLAA guidance and the Council has sought to engage with appropriate stakeholders on both the methodology and by invitation to submit sites for assessment. Ongoing consultation will continue as the SHLAA is a living document and subject to continuous review.

8.3 At this stage, the following tables indicate the likely potential housing supply based on 30 dwellings per hectare, 50 dwellings per hectare and indicative schemes.

Deleted: -

Deleted: This information will be revised following the production of indicative schemes as advocated in the SHLAA guidance.

8.4 Of the 42 sites considered suitable to contribute positively towards the SHLAA total, the following breakdown has been provided for information.

Deleted: 43

Total dwellings at a density of 30 dph ²	1124
Total dwellings in windfall allowance	270
Total dwellings identified through SHLAA	1394
Completions 06 to 08 ³	631
Allowance for small site commitments at 1 April 2008	59
Total	2084
Total Number of sites	41
Brownfield sites	23 (56%)
Greenfield sites	15 (37%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	3 (7%)
Total number of dwellings @30 dph	1124
Brownfield dwellings	707(63%)
Greenfield dwellings	285(25%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	132(12%)

Deleted: 690

² Includes large scale commitments and small site commitments +5 dwellings detailed in section 4 of this report

³ Excludes completions on LP04 which are recorded as dwellings identified through SHLAA

Deleted: October 2008

Total dwellings at a density of 50 dph ⁴	1446
Total dwellings in windfall allowance	270
Total dwellings identified through SHLAA	1716
Completions 06 to 08 ⁵	631
Allowance for small site commitments at 1 April 2008	59
Total	2406
Total Number of sites	41
Brownfield sites	23 (56%)
Greenfield sites	15 (37%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	3 (7%)
Total number of dwellings @50 dph	1446
Brownfield dwellings	780 (54%)
Greenfield dwellings	445 (31%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	221 (15%)

Deleted: 690

⁴ Includes large scale commitments and small site commitments +5 dwellings detailed in section 4 of this report

⁵ Excludes completions on LP04 which are recorded as dwellings identified through SHLAA

Deleted: October 2008

Total dwellings based on indicative schemes ⁶	1213
Total dwellings in windfall allowance	270
Total dwellings identified through SHLAA	1483
Completions 06 to 08 ⁷	631
Allowance for small site commitments at 1 April 2008	59
Total	2173
Total Number of sites	41
Brownfield sites	23 (56%)
Greenfield sites	15 (37%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	3 (7%)
Total number of dwellings based on indicative schemes	1213
Brownfield dwellings	734 (61%)
Greenfield dwellings	270 (22%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	209 (17%)

Deleted: 690

⁶ Includes large scale commitments and small site commitments +5 dwellings detailed in section 4 of this report

⁷ Excludes completions on LP04 which are recorded as dwellings identified through SHLAA

Deleted: October 2008

Appendix 1

Details of all bodies who were contacted on 1 February 2008 inviting them to contribute to the SHLAA partnership

Put on this list consultants by post or e-mail
on 1-2-03

List of Developers/Consultants

MR R SCOTT

MS C WILLIAMS

MR J C ASHTON

THE ORCHARD OFFICE, UNION PLACE
WORCESTER
WR3 7DX

MR D CORDEN

SPRINGFIELD, SAMBOURNE LANE
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS

A VICTOR POWELL

12 ST JOHN STREET,
BROMSGROVE
WORCS

ADAMS AND CREED

4 WORCESTER ROAD,
BROMSGROVE
WORCS B61 7AE

ALAN SMITH ASSOC.

2 MILL LANE,
FECKENHAM
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6HY

AILAN MORRIS PEACE & BURFORD

292 EVESHAM ROAD,
REDDITCH
WORCS

ANDREW GRANT

CHURCH GREEN EAST,
REDDITCH
WORCS

ANDREW MARTIN ASSOCIATES

INNOVATE OFFICE, LAKE VIEW DRIVE
SHERWOOD PARK
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DT

ATISREAL

MR A MORGAN

9 COLMORE ROW,
BIRMINGHAM
B3 2BJ

BAIRSTOW EVES

OSBOURNE HOUSE, 13 CHURCH GREEN EAST
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8BP

List of Developers/Consultants

BARRATT WEST MIDLANDS
MR M KOWALSKI
MIDLAND HOUSE, NEW ROAD
HALESOWEN
WEST MIDS B63 3HY

BDHT
MR M BROWN

BOURNVILLE VILLAGE TRUST
MS R JONES HEAD OF BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT
155 OAK TREE LANE,
BOURNVILLE
BIRMINGHAM

BRADLEY DESIGN HOMES
HOLLOWFIELDS FARM, HOLLOWFIELDS ROAD
HANBURY
WORCS

BRUTON KNOWLES
MR I MERCER
48 QUEEN STREET,
WOLVERHAMPTON
WV1 3BP

CB RICHARD ELLIS
MR A BOWE
CORNWALL COURT, 19 CORNWALL STREET
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDS B3 2DT

BARTON WILMORE PLANNING
MS J WALTERS DIRECTOR
FIRST FLOOR, CORNER OAK
HOMER ROAD
SOLIHULL
B91 3QG

BIGWOOD CHARTERED SURVEYORS
MR C M TOTNEY
51-52 CALTHORPE ROAD,
EDGBASTON
BIRMINGHAM
B15 1TH

BOVIS LENDLEASE LTD
MR P DAVIES
142 NORTH HOLT ROAD,
HARROW
MIDDLESEX HA2 0EE

BROMFORD HOUSING
MR D OWEN

BRYANT GROUP / TAYLOR WOODROW
MS S MILWARD PLANNING MANAGER
2 PRINCES WAY,
SOLIHULL
WEST MIDS B91 3ES

CHARLES MARTIN HOMES
BROADACRES, FOREST LANE
HANBURY
WORCS B60 4HR

List of Developers/Consultants

COMFIRST
MR N POTTER

,

COMMUNITY HOUSING
MS Y LEISHMAN

,

COUNTRY & METROPOLITAN PLC
MR B CALDWELL
RISSINGTON BUSINESS PARK, UPPER RISSINGTON
NR CHELTENHAM
GLOS GL54 2QB

CROSBY HOMES MIDLANDS LTD
16 NORFOLK ROAD,
EDGBASTON
BIRMINGHAM
B15 3SN

DARREN BLOWER
7 CHURCH GREEN EAST,
REDDITCH
WORCS

DAVID PAYNE HOMES LTD
Mr R PHIPPS LAND AND PLANNING MANAGER
KNARSBORO HOUSE, KIDDERMINSTER ROAD
BROMSGROVE
WORCS B61 7JP

DAVID WALKER CHARTERED SURVEYORS
MR N BROOKE
ALBION HOUSE, 89 STATION ROAD
ECKINGTON
SHEFFIELD
S21 4FW

DAVID WILSON HOMES
MR D CHEAL SENIOR LAND MANAGER
ENTERPRISE HOUSE, PENDEFORD BUSINESS PARK
WOBASTON ROAD
PENDERFORD
WOLVERHAMPTON WV9 5HA

DEV PLAN UK
J R PATTERSON
13 SOUTH CLIFTON STREET,
LYTHAM
Lincs FY8 5HN

DIALOGUE
MR S HANLEY
136-148 TOOLEY STREET,
LONDON
SE1 2TU

DRIVERS JONAS
N DIMENT
6 GROSVENOR STREET,
LONDON

DRS DEVELOPMENTS
MR D SANDERS
THE GRANARY, THE MEARSE, MEARSE LANE
INKBERROW
WORCS WR7 4HS

List of Developers/Consultants

ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS
MR S WILLBY PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER
JORDAN HOUSE WEST, HALL PARK
HALL PARK WAY
TELFORD
SHROPS TF3 4NN

FISHER GERMAN
MS L WILLISCROFT
THE GRANGE, 80 TAMWORTH ROAD
ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH
LEICS LE65 2BW

FRAMPTONS
L CUSDIN PLANNING PROJECTS ADMINISTRATOR
BEAUFORT HOUSE, 4 SOUTH BAR
BANBURY
OXON OX16 9AA

GL HEARN
MS N THOMPSON
LEONARD HOUSE, 5-7 MARSHALSEA ROAD
LONDON BRIDGE
LONDON

GOUGH PLANNING SERVICES
MILL COURT, MILL STREET
STAFFORD
ST16 2AJ

GREENVILLA DEVELOPMENTS LTD
3 FOXBURY DRIVE,
DORRIDGE
SOLIHULL
WEST MIDLANDS B93 8JW

FESTIVAL (SPA)
MS G COPE HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT
GROVEWOOD ROAD,
MALVERN LINK
WORCS

FOSSEWAY HOUSING
MS K POWELL HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT
C/O UNIT 1 MILLER COURT, SEVERN DRIVE
TEWKESBURY B P
TEWKESBURY
GLOS

GALLAGHER UK LTD
MR D KEYSE DEVELOPMENT PLANNER
GALLAGHER HOUSE, GALLAGHER WAY
GALLAGHER BUSINESS PARK
WARWICK
CV34 6AF

GMA PLANNING
MS H GREENHALGH
QUEENS HOUSE, HOLLY ROAD
TWICKENHAM
TW1 4EG

GR PLANNING CONSULTANCY
CHILDS FARM,
HINTON
CHIPPENHAM

GUINNESS TRUST
C LOWE MANAGER
C/O 5 FOUR OAKS CLOSE,
HEADLESS CROSS
REDDITCH
WORCS

List of Developers/Consultants

GVA GRIMLEY
MS S WILLIAMS
3 BRINDLEY PLACE,
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDLANDS B1 2JB

HANSONS
6 NEW ROAD,
BROMSGROVE
WORCS B60 2JD

HARRIS LAMB
MS C OSBORN planner
GROSVENOR HOUSE, 75-76 FRANCIS STREET
EDGBASTON
BIRMINGHAM
B16 8SP

HOME BUILDERS FEDERATION
MR T WATTON REGIONAL POLICY MANAGER
FIRST FLOOR, OAKFIELD HOUSE, SMALL HEATH BUSINESS PARK
TALBOT WAY
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDLANDS B10 0HJ

HOUSING CORPORATION
C SEATON

JOHN SANDERS
THE ESTATE OFFICE, 8 NEW ROAD
BROMSGROVE
WORCS

HALIFAX ESTATE AGENTS
46 HIGH STREET,
BROMSGROVE
WORCS

HARDYS & HANSONS
MR M DRAPER ACQUISITION MANAGER
THE BREWERY, KIMBERLEY
NOTTINGHAM
NG16 2NS

HEMMINGS
22 UNICORN HILL,
REDDITCH
WORCS

HOUSING 21
MR C TAYLOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
9 AVRO COURT, ERMINE BUSINESS PARK
HUNTINGDON
CAMBS

JEPHSON
MS S GOUGH HOUSING MANAGER
TRAFALGAR HOUSE, KING STREET
DUDLEY
WEST MIDLANDS

JOHN TRUSLOVE
DARALBEE HOUSE, ARCHER ROAD
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8DJ

List of Developers/Consultants

JOWITT ASSOCIATES

MR N CROWTHER

82 NORTHWOOD STREET,
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDS

JS BLOOR LTD

ASHBY ROAD,
MEASHAM
SWADLINCOTE

JUDITH HITCHIN

57 HEWELL ROAD,
BARNT GREEN

~~KING STUBBS~~

~~MS J HOOPER~~

~~0112 000~~

LAING HOMES

39 DOMINION COURT, STATION ROAD
SOLIHULL
WEST MIDLANDS

LAMBERTS

11 ALCESTER STREET,
REDDITCH
WORCS

LANDMARK INFORMATION GROUP LTD

MR J TIPPINS

7 ABBEY COURT, EAGLE WAY
SOWTON
EXETER EX2 7HY

LEVEL

MS E WEAVER POLICY AND RESEARCH OFFICER

LEIGH HOUSE, 147 LEIGH ROAD
WIMBORNE
DORSET BH21 2AD

LINDA GILLESPIE

1196A EVESHAM ROAD,
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS

LLOYDS PROPERTIES LTD

THE OLD CHURCH, ALCESTER STREET
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8AE

MALCOLM JUDD & PARTNERS FOR

HALFORDS LTD

70 HIGH STREET,
CHISLEHURST
KENT BR7 5AQ

~~MANOR HOMES LTD~~

~~4 CHESTNUT ROAD,
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS~~

*deleted
(moved away)*

List of Developers/Consultants

MCINERNEY HOMES
NIGHTINGALE PLACE, PENDEFORD BUSINESS PARK
WOLVERHAMPTON
WV9 5HF

MILLER HOMES WEST MIDLANDS
3620 PARKSIDE, BIRMINGHAM BUSINESS PARK
SOLIHULL
BIRMINGHAM
B37 7YG

NEIL SHEPHERD DESIGN LTD
MR N SHEPHERD
GOLDENLY, GRAFTON LANE
BINTON
STRATFORD-UPON-AVON
CV37 9TZ

NEXUS (WEST MERCIA HG)
MS A COOMBS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
BARNESLEY HALL, BARNESLEY HALL ROAD
CATSHILL
BROMSGROVE
WORCS


POULSNAM
11A CHURCH GREEN EAST,
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8BP

PEGASUS PLANNING GROUP
MR H JONES PRINCIPAL PLANNER
5 THE PRIORY, OLD LONDON ROAD
CANWELL
SUTTON COLDFIELD
WEST MIDS B75 5SH

MIDLAND HEART
MR N BYRNE INTERIM DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT
BATH ROW,
BIRMINGHAM

MORRIS HOMES (WEST MIDLANDS) LTD
MR R JOHNSON REGIONAL LAND DIRECTOR
DELTA HOUSE, PENDEFORD BUSINESS PARK
WOBASTON ROAD
WOLVERHAMPTON
WV9 5HA

NEIL SHEPHERD DESIGN LTD
MR N SHEPHERD
GOLDEN LEA, GRAFTON LANE
BINTON
STRATFORD-ON-AVON
WARKS CV37 9TZ

 **ORBIT**
MR A QUINLAN
,

PEACOCK AND SMITH LTD
SUITE 2A, JOSEPHS WELL
HANNOVER WALK
LEEDS
LS3 1AB

PENRILLA CONSULTANTS LTD
MR D LOBBAN
ALDOR, RILLA MILL
CALLINGTON
CORNWALL PL17 7NT

List of Developers/Consultants

PERSIMMON HOMES (SOUTH MIDLANDS) LTD
MR C MAY STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER
PERSIMMON HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM ROAD
STUDLEY
WARKS B80 7BG

PREMIER PLACES
9 CHURCH GREEN WEST,
REDDITCH
WORCS B97 4DX

PROPERTY SERVICES - REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

REDDITCH FRIENDS
MS G MUNSLOW MANAGER
37 OXHILL CLOSE,
MATCHBOROUGH WEST
REDDITCH
WORCS

RIDGEWAYS
MR S ISAAC
RIDGEWAY HOUSE, 1 HIGH STREET
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6DB

RPS
MR M SACKETT
HIGHFIELD HOUSE, 5 RIDGEWAY
QUINTON BUSINESS PARK
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDLANDS B32 1AF

PLANNING PROSPECTS
MR J M TAIT DIRECTOR
1 BROOMHALL BUISNESS CENTRE, BROOMHALL LANE
WORCESTER
WORCS WR5 2NT

PRIORY ASSET LTD
MR S GRUNDY MANAGING DIRECTOR
CENTRIX HOUSE, CROW LANE EAST
NEWTON-LE-WILLOWS
MERSEYSIDE WA12 9UY

REDDITCH CO-OP HOMES
MR C TAYLOR MANAGER
BRITTEN HOUSE, BRITTEN STREET
REDDITCH
WORCS

REDDITCH YMCA
MS J INGAMELLS MANAGER
CHURCH HILL CENTRE,
CHURCH HILL
REDDITCH
WORCS

ROOFTOP
MR D HANNON DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
70 HIGH STREET,
EVESHAM
WORCS

SANCTUARY HOUSING
MR G TURNER

List of Developers/Consultants

SANDERS AND SANDERS

BURTON HOUSE, HIGH STREET
ALCESTER
WARKS B49 5AB

SAVILLS

MR C STILL ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR

CAXTON HOUSE, 1 FORE STREET
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDS B2 5ER

SECONDSITE PROPERTY

MR P SHEPPARD PLANNING MANAGER

AVIARY COURT, WADE ROAD
BASINGSTOKE
HAMPSHIRE RG24 8GZ

SHIPWAYS

3 ALCESTER STREET,
REDDITCH
WORCS

SMITH, STUART, REYNOLDS

MR S SMITH MANAGING DIRECTOR

COTTAGE FARM,
SYWELL
NORTHAMPTON
NN6 0BJ

SOUTH WARWICKSHIRE HA

MR J PAGE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER

10 GREENHILL STREET,
STRATFORD ON AVON
WARKS

STANSGATE PLANNING CONSULTANTS

MS M ROGERS SENIOR PLANNER

CONRAD HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM ROAD
STRATFORD-UPON-AVON
WARKS CV37 0AA

STEWART ROSS ASSOC.

MS L ROSS

8 WESTVILLE AVENUE,
ILKLEY
WEST YORKSHIRE L29 9AH

STEWART VICK ASSOC.

MR S E VICK

274 EVESHAM ROAD,
HEADLESS CROSS
REDDITCH
WORCS B97 5EP

STONELEIGH PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

MR R DUNNETT

KINGSLEY HOUSE, 63 HOLLY WALK
LEAMINGTON SPA
WARKS CV32 4JG

SUNRISE PROPERTIES

MS S FAROOQUI

3 MEADOW HILL ROAD,
RIVERSIDE
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8HN

TERENCE O'ROURKE PLC

MS S BEALE INFORMATION RESOURCE MANAGER

EVERDENE HOUSE, DEANSLEIGH ROAD
BOURNEMOUTH
BH7 7DU

List of Developers/Consultants

TETLOW KING PLANNING
MR J EDWARDS
UNIT 2, ECLIPSE OFFICE PARK
STAPLE HILL
BRISTOL
BS16 5EL

THE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PARTNERSHIP
J VOSE
40 BARTON ARCADE,
MANCHESTER

TRIBAL MJP
F WYE PLANNING RESEARCH MANAGER
70 HIGH STREET,
CHISLEHURST
KENT BR7 5AQ

TWEEDALE
MR C RICHARDS
265 TETTENHALL ROAD,
WOLVERHAMPTON
WV6 0DE

VIZORS
17 CHURCH GREEN EAST,
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8BP

WALL JAMES & DAVIES
MRS E MITCHELL
15 - 23 HAGLEY ROAD,
STOURBRIDGE
WEST MIDLANDS

THE BELL CORNWELL PARTNERSHIP
MR J W CORNWELL
OAKVIEW HOUSE, STATION ROAD
HOOK
HAMPSHIRE RG27 9TP

THE PLANNING BUREAU LTD
MR P THOMPSON PLANNING TECHNICIAN
HOMELIFE HOUSE, 26-32 OXFORD ROAD
BOURNEMOUTH
DORSET BH8 8EZ

TURLEY ASSOCIATES
MR A T BARKER
APSLEY HOUSE, 35 WATERLOO STREET
BIRMINGHAM
B2 5TJ

TYLER-PARKES PARTNERSHIP
MR J SAMMON
CENTRE COURT,
1301 STRATFORD ROAD
HALL GREEN
BIRMINGHAM B28 9HH

W M HOUSING
MS E MARK

~~X WATERLOO
MR G MCNAMEE~~

List of Developers/Consultants

WATERMAN BOREHAM LTD
REGENT HOUSE, HUBERT ROAD
BRENTWOOD
ESSEX CM14 4JE

WESTBURY HOMES HOLDINGS LTD
MR S METHVEN
CENTRAL HOUSE, SABRE CLOSE
QUEDGELEY
GLOUCESTER
GL2 4NZ

WESTGROVE DEVT
MR R POTTER
OSBOURNE HOUSE, 13 CHURCH GREEN EAST
REDDITCH
WORCS

WIMPEY HOMES WEST MIDLANDS LTD
MS A SMITH
39 DOMINION COURT, STATION ROAD
SOLIHULL
WEST MIDLANDS B91 3RT

FOUR MOVE
16 CHURCH GREEN EAST,
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8BP

List of RBC Consultees

MR A GOLDRICK
TOOKEYS FARMHOUSE, TOOKEYS DRIVE
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6BB

ALVECHURCH PARISH COUNCIL
MS G LUNGLEY PARISH CLERK
16 THE SQUARE,
ALVECHURCH
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDLANDS B48 7LA

BEÖLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MISS P HARRISON PARISH CLERK
16 MYRTLE AVENUE,
KINGS HEATH
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDS B47 5DU

COOKHILL PARISH COUNCIL
MS M J ROGERS CLERK TO THE PARISH
1308 EVESHAM ROAD,
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6AZ

DIOCESE OF WORCESTER
MR R HIGHAM DIOCESAN SECRETARY
THE OLD PALACE,
DEANSWAY
WORCESTER
WR1 2JE

FECKENHAM PARISH COUNCIL
MR I BELLION THE ACTING CLERK
c/o CHAPEL COTTAGE, MILL LANE
FECKENHAM
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6HY

MR M WRIGHT
SYRINGA, 1B CASTLE STREET
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6DP

BENTLEY PAUNCEFOOT PARISH COUNCIL
MRS T GREEN PARISH CLERK
9 ALDERMANS LANE,
BROCKHILL
REDDITCH
WORCD B97 6TJ

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL
MR M DUNPHY DEVELOPMENT PLANS MANAGER
THE COUNCIL HOUSE, BURCOT LANE
BROMSGROVE
WORCS B60 1AA

COUNTRY LAND & BUSINESS ASSOC.
MISS D TAVERNOR
KNIGHTLEY,
WOODSEAVES
STAFFS ST20 0JW

ENGLISH HERITAGE
MISS A SMITH REGIONAL PLANNER
112 COLMORE ROW,
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDLANDS B3 3AG

HANBURY PARISH COUNCIL
MRS J HARRISON PARISH CLERK
WOODSIDE HOUSE, LITTLEWORTH LANE
BERROW HILL
FECKENHAM
WORCS B96 6QP

List of RBC Consultees

HIGHWAYS PARTNERSHIP
MR D PILCHER COMMUNITY & RESPONSE UNIT
WORCESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL, SPETCHLEY ROAD
WORCESTER
WR5 2NP

INKBERROW PARISH COUNCIL
MRS J CRESSWELL
THE BIZZI BEE, CHURCH ROAD
BRADLEY GREEN
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6RW

NIGEL POOLE & MCGINN
24 CHURCH GREEN EAST,
REDDITCH
WORCS

SALEWAY PARISH COUNCIL
MRS S BRADNICK PARISH CLERK
PEAR TREE HOUSE, EARLS COMMON
WORCESTER
WR9 7LD

SPORT ENGLAND WEST MIDLANDS
MR B SHARPLES SENIOR PLANNING MANAGER
5th FLOOR, No 3 BROADWAY, FIVE WAYS
BIRMINGHAM
WEST MIDLANDS B15 1BQ

STRATFORD-ON-AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL
MR C STAVES
ELIZABETH HOUSE, CHURCH STREET
STRATFORD-UPON-AVON
WARKS CV37 6HX

HOUSING CORPORATION
MR N REED DIRECTOR OF INVESTMENT
NORWICH UNION HOUSE, 31 WATERLOO ROAD
WOLVERHAMPTON
WEST MIDLANDS WV1 4BP

METTIS AEROSPACE LTD
MR T PEGG SAFETY, HEALTH & ENVIRONMENT MGR
WINDSOR ROAD,
REDDITCH
WORCS B97 6EF

REDDITCH CO-OPERATIVE HOMES
MR C TAYLOR MANAGER
BRITTEN HOUSE, BRITTEN STREET
REDDITCH
WORCS B97 6HD

SAMBOURNE PARISH COUNCIL
DR C CLEWS CHAIRMAN
DOMUS FABALIS, MIDDLETOWN LANE
SAMBOURNE
WARKS B96 6NX

STOCK & BRADLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MRS M WARING PARISH CLERK
STADDLE STONES,
STOCK GREEN
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6TB

STUDLEY PARISH COUNCIL
MRS D MITCHELL PARISH CLERK
PARISH OFFICE, HIGH STREET
STUDLEY
WARKS B80 7HJ

List of RBC Consultees

TUTNALL AND COBLEY PARISH COUNCIL

MRS H DAVIES CLERK

118 NEW ROAD

ASTON FIELDS

BROMSGROVE

WORCS B60 2LD

WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

MS S PRETORIOUS

PO BOX 43, SHIRE HALL

WARWICK

WARKS CV34 4SX

Appendix 2

Housing Site Suggestion form and consultation letter



Town Hall, Alcester Street,
Redditch, Worcestershire. B98 8AH
Telephone: (01527) 64252 Facsimile: (01527) 65216
Minicom: 595528 DX: 19106 Redditch
Nearest Car Parking - Car Park 2

Contact: Mrs A Grimmett
Extn: 3209
alison.grimmett@redditchbc.gov.uk

1 February 2008

Dear Sir,

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing, requires local authorities to identify land with potential to accommodate new housing development over the Local Development Framework plan period (2006-2026). The methodology for the Assessment will follow the 'Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: Practice Guidance published by DCLG in July 2007. (<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/strategichousingmarket>)

I am currently in the process of beginning the SHLAA for Redditch Borough and am writing to you with respect to two issues:

- i) Sites with development potential for housing; and
- ii) Preparation of the SHLAA.

Sites with development potential for housing

If you are able to identify any land which should be considered as part of the Housing Land Availability Assessment, please can you let me have details of sites as soon as possible and before 31 March 2008. I have attached a site identification form in order to gather some initial data of sites which could be included in the Assessment. If you have more than one site to put forward, please copy the form as many times as necessary and use a separate form for each site. At this point in time, no limit has been agreed as to the minimum site size for assessment, so please include sites of all sizes, anywhere in the Borough.

This Assessment will cover land within Redditch Borough only. However, due to cross-boundary housing allocations in the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands, there will be a separate joint assessment with Bromsgrove District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council covering the area beyond Redditch's boundary.

If you have any land interests beyond the Borough boundary which may fall under the remit of this second Assessment, please submit site identification forms to me now so that I can begin to co-ordinate this data as well.

Preparation of the SHLAA

The Practice Guidance clearly states that local authorities should not be carrying out these assessments in isolation and should draw on the knowledge and experience of stakeholders/ agencies. If you would be interested in having an additional input into this Assessment, please let me know as soon as possible.

I look forward to hearing from you shortly regarding these matters. If you have any queries in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alison Grimm', with a small flourish at the end.

Alison Grimm
Planning Officer

**Redditch Borough Council
Strategic Housing Land Availability
Assessment**

HOUSING SITE SUGGESTION FORM

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Reference Number:

Date Received:

**Please indicate which local
authority area the site is in:**

Redditch ☐

Bromsgrove ☐

Stratford ☐

Please use this form to provide information on sites you wish to suggest for
inclusion in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

A separate form should be completed for each site suggested.

Please provide a site plan identifying the land suggested at a scale of no less than
1:2500

Personal Details:	Agents Details: (if applicable)
Name: (BLOCK CAPITALS)	Name: (BLOCK CAPITALS)
Organisation: (if applicable)	Organisation: (if applicable)
Job Title: (where relevant)	Job Title: (where relevant)
Address:	Address:
Postcode:	Postcode:
Telephone:	Telephone:
Email:	Email:

Site Information
Site Location: (Address and OS grid reference)
Site Area and Description:
Current Land Use: (e.g. agriculture, employment, unused/ vacant etc)
Type of Site: (e.g. greenfield, previously developed land as defined in Annex B of PPS3)
Means of access into the site:

Continued overleaf...

Site Information continued

Access to public transport: (e.g. bus and rail services)

Obvious physical constraints: (e.g. slopes, trees, flood potential, natural features, pylons etc.)

Ecological features and areas of biological importance:

Availability of utilities and services: (e.g. water supply and sewage disposal)

Any development progress: (e.g. groundworks or building under construction)

Availability of the site: (e.g. within 5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years)

Ownership:

Landowners attitude to development of the site:

Supporting Comments: (please note, only a brief summary is required)

Signature:

Date:

Please return your completed form and plan to:

Alison Grimmett
Development Plans
Redditch Borough Council
Walter Stranz Square
Redditch
Worcs. B98 8AH

The Council may not include your site in the SHLAA if the form is received later than 31 March 2008

Office Use:
Logged, entered in database, appraisal sheet generated

Appendix 3

Sites identified by White Young Green which may have development potential

Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
Butlers Hill Lane	Not surveyed. Land considered in Local Plan No.2 Modifications Inspectors Report to be provided as strategic open space for the Brockhill development. It is a strategic open space buffer between housing and employment land uses
Pheasant Lane	Part of site picked up for survey under Local Plan No.3 sites to meet potential housing requirement shortfalls (LPX02). Remainder of site not surveyed as dense undergrowth and mature trees plus some land associated with community facility uses
Birchfield Road	Not surveyed. Green Belt land – development of this site is not in a suitable location to be incorporated into longer term growth options beyond Redditch on neighbouring Green Belt land
Wirehill North	Site picked up for survey under UCS 8.47 & UCS 8.10
Hunt End Lane	Site picked up for survey under UCS 3.23
Oakenshaw Road	Site picked up for survey under Local Plan No.3 sites to meet potential housing requirement shortfalls (LPX07)
Rye Grass Lane	Not surveyed. Eastern half of site would bring properties too close to Windmill Drive with no natural screening/ sound buffer. Far western area of site is deeply pitted with several mature oak trees and dense hedgerow. Remainder of site may be suitable for around four dwellings and therefore falls below the site yield threshold for the SHLAA

Deleted: target

Deleted: target

Appendix 4

Site Analysis form

**Redditch Borough Council
Strategic Housing Land Availability
Assessment**

HOUSING SITE ANALYSIS FORM

Survey Date:

Site Address:	Site Ref:
Ownership Details:	Site Area:
	Grid Ref:
Current Land Use:	
Surrounding Land Uses:	
Character of Surrounding Area:	
Previous Source: (e.g. BORLP3, UCS, WYG Report, omission site, other)	
New Source: (e.g. landowner, developer etc)	
Relevant Planning History: (including most recent ownership details)	
Detailed Planning Permission: <input type="checkbox"/>	Details:
Outline Planning Permission: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Previous Local Plan Allocation: <input type="checkbox"/>	

Stage A	
Conformity with Strategic Policy for Development Distribution/Settlement Hierarchy	Details
Brownfield (previously developed) site that is within or adjoining a settlement and is within Redditch Borough	
Greenfield or Green Belt site which is within or adjoining a settlement and is within Redditch Borough	
Any site (either brownfield, Greenfield or Green Belt) that is not within, or adjoining any settlement and is within Redditch Borough – site will be discounted	
Any site which falls within the WYG Study Boundary which may form part of a direction of growth for Redditch needs beyond the Redditch Borough Boundary (site to be assessed under separate study)	

Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	
Is a scheduled Ancient Monument located on the site?	Details
Yes: Site will be discounted	
No: Does the site fall within or significantly affect any other site of designated international, regional or local value, or affect habitat for protected flora or fauna? Does the site affect trees, hedgerows or areas of ancient woodland not subject to statutory protection?	
No: No significant adverse impact on biodiversity	
Yes:	
Opportunity to enhance/no significant adverse impact	
Significant adverse impact (mitigation to be explored)	
Significant adverse impact – site will be discounted unless it can be demonstrated that mitigation can be successfully introduced	

Land at risk of Flooding	
Is the site in an area of known flooding risk?	Details
No: Little/no risk of flooding	
Yes:	
Zone 1 – Little or no risk	
Zone 2 – Low to medium risk (mitigation to be explored)	
Zone 3 – High risk – Site will be discounted unless it can be demonstrated that mitigation can be successfully introduced	

Stage B	
Other Environmental Issues:	
Impact on the historic, cultural and built environment	
How would the site affect the setting and character of a Listed Building or Conservation Area? How would the site impact on the existing character of the Settlement?	Details
Opportunity to enhance/no adverse impact	
Adverse impact/impact but could be mitigated	
Significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated	

Sustainability:	
Access to Public Transport	
Is the site well related to a bus stop (or railway station)?	Details
Less than 400m (walking distance)	
Between 400m and 800m (walking distance)	
Over 800m (walking distance) or ineffective service	

Access to services and facilities	
Walking distance to nearest first school:	
Less than 1.5km	
Between 1.5km and 3km	
Over 3km	
Walking distance to nearest local retail facilities:	
Less than 800m	
Between 800m and 1600m	
Over 1600m	
Walking distance to nearest health facilities:	
Less than 800m	
Between 800m and 1600m	
Over 1600m	

Constraints to Delivery	
Level of Contamination on Site:	
None	
Contamination that can be overcome through land remediation	
High level of contamination that cannot be realistically mitigated	
Are there any Physical Constraints on site?	
No	
Yes, but can be overcome	
Yes and cannot be overcome	
Are there TPOs on site?	
No	
A single TPO	
Group TPO	
Is there a Public Right of Way on the site?	
No	
Yes	

Open Space & Recreation	
Would the site result in the loss of these facilities?	Details
No	
Yes, but indication of replacement provision possible on, next to or near to the site as part of the development	
Yes. No possibility of replacement provision	

Employment Land	
Would development of the site result in the loss of employment land?	Details
No	
Yes - <u>demonstrated</u> that land will not come forward for employment uses	
Yes - land is not likely to come forward for employment uses	
Yes - land is likely to come forward for employment uses	
Infrastructure Capacity	
Is the site considered adequately served by existing infrastructure (e.g. utilities and highways) or can it be adequately served?	Details
Sufficient infrastructure in place to serve development	
Infrastructure constraints that would require investment to overcome but can probably be addressed by developer contributions	
Significant infrastructure constraints, i.e. strategic infrastructure required which may require Government grants	

Highway Access	
Can the site be accessed by vehicle from the highway?	Details
Direct access to main/adopted road	
Access to unadopted road/track	
No access	

Compatibility with adjoining uses	
Would development of the site for residential uses be compatible with existing and/or proposed adjoining uses?	Details
No compatibility issues	
Insignificant or moderate compatibility issues	
Residential development considered incompatible (discount site for residential)	

Stage C	
Availability	
Is the site immediately available for development?	
Yes	
No	
What is the predominant land type on the site?	Details
Brownfield or Greenfield within or adjacent to a settlement Therefore available within 0 - 5 years	
ADR Therefore available within 5 - 10 years	
Green Belt Therefore available beyond 10 years	

Achievability	
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development	Details
Yes, or issues which can be resolved within 5 years	
Possibly, or with issues which can be resolved within 10 years	
No, issues which cannot be resolved	

Appropriate timeframe for development?	Details
0-5 years	
5-10 years	
10years +	

Potential Residential Yield	
Appropriate Density	Total number of Dwellings

Appendix 5

Comments received on the draft Site Analysis form and any actions taken with respect to updating the form

Comment	Redditch Borough Council Response
Are you applying a minimum site size threshold to make the task manageable?	Only sites over 0.16 ha in size were considered, i.e. they are able to accommodate a minimum of 5 dwellings
The proposed assessment form seems fine – I can't think of anything to add	
Stage A	
Suggest that it would be clearer if biodiversity and geodiversity were separated from built heritage, i.e. archaeology, listed buildings, cons areas	Considered not necessary. Redditch has almost no minerals deposits that would need consideration. All sites will receive comments from RBC Countryside & Biodiversity Officer
SAMs are only a small sample of the resource. You need to make reference to other sites of archaeological interest	All sites will receive comments from WCC Historic Environment Service
It appears that the proposed Redditch SHLAA methodology has been designed as a three stage assessment. However, under the Redditch methodology, sites which do not meet specific criteria would be excluded from subsequent evaluation stages. This does not appear to follow the Government's guidance and could result in a study that would not provide sound evidence base to underpin the Redditch Core Strategy DPD	Stage A is the only stage at which sites will be discounted. In line with the emerging RSS, the approach has been taken to not consider sites that are not within or adjacent to Redditch's urban area and in unsustainable locations. It is considered unrealistic to rely on sites which should not be developed i.e. unsustainable rural sites or sites in the flood zone. Some sites may reappear in future updates to the SHLAA if landowners can demonstrate successful mitigation measures. The traffic light rating applied to Stage B will not exclude sites from the SHLAA, it is merely a mechanism to identify at a glance, which sites may not be as straight forward to bring forward for development as others i.e. access issues such as improved visibility displays
Why, for example, biodiversity has been identified as a more important constraint than, for example, access to public transport. In theory, any constraint could prevent the development of a site, depending on its severity	
It appears that discounting sites on the grounds of their lack of compliance with existing strategic policy designations would be contrary to Government guidance on the preparation of SHLAAs	
It appears that several of the questions contained within the draft form cannot be answered on a "desktop" basis i.e. without the benefit of significant technical or survey work. Examples of these include: Stage A - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Heritage, Stage B - Impact on the Historic, Cultural and Built Environment, Stage B - Constraints to Delivery. It appears that it would not be possible for the Borough Council to answer the above questions or reach conclusions on the issues raised by them without either receiving substantial technical information from the owners of the sites or carrying out the work itself	All sites will receive comments from RBC Countryside & Biodiversity Officer and WCC Historic Environment Service. Information will be drawn from the Worcestershire Biological Records Centre. With respect to constraints to delivery, it will be for the landowner to demonstrate successful mitigation measures to overcome any constraints. In these instances, sites will be rated more positively in future SHLAA updates
Flood Risk - Part of a site may fall within Flood Risk Zone 3. However, this should not lead to the	It will be for the landowner to demonstrate successful mitigation measures to overcome

Comment	Redditch Borough Council Response
whole site being discounted as unsuitable for development	flooding constraints. In these instances, sites will be rated more positively in future SHLAA updates
Stage B	
Would a reference to distance from health facilities be useful in that S.106 contributions towards these is a growing issue?	Noted and included
Access to Services and Facilities section to include GP practices	
Mixed uses. You should make reference to whether a site will need to accommodate uses other than residential. This will certainly influence capacity assumptions as mentioned above	Sites which could provide for a mix of uses will be excluded until detailed schemes are in place as it is considered unreliable to estimate a housing contribution without further investigation beyond the remit of the SHLAA. Such sites will reappear in future updates of the SHLAA if they have a housing element included in the scheme
Form should include details of the surrounding uses and character of the area in order to provide a context to the nominated site	Noted and included
Should there be a distinction between No risk of flooding and the Zone 1 category with Little or no risk	Distinction considered unnecessary
It could assist your assessment if the form included additional provision for the various locations and sizes of site which might not currently satisfy the access to public transport but could reasonably be expected to following development	Considered unnecessary
Consider the proportion of the site that would need remediation to overcome any potential problem. Grade into five categories ranging from very small to total site area	Too much detail for an initial assessment of sites. Landowners should assess level of remediation measures as part of any planning application submission where necessary
In addition to loss of open space, add another section identifying sites where new facilities might be available either on or adjacent proposed sites	Loss of open space through development of a site would require developers to demonstrate if need for the development outweighed the value of the land for open space in accordance with planning policies and would form part of any planning application submission where necessary
Specifically identify sites where the connection to utilities can be achieved with minimum disruption to adjacent areas	Considered unnecessary
Access to Public Transport - the term "ineffective service" requires clarification. Furthermore, the site analysis form could provide an opportunity to demonstrate how a site could underpin and support existing or currently unviable transport services	Considered unnecessary as landowners should demonstrate how a site could underpin and support existing or currently unviable transport services as part of any planning application submission where necessary

Stage C	
Shouldn't this include a Suitability section which summarizes the outcome from Stages A & B? This is the point at which you say whether the site is worth further serious consideration for inclusion within the LDF or describe why the site is not a contender for requirement	Any sites deemed unsuitable for consideration following site assessment are detailed in Section 7 of this report.
Availability: I'm unclear what assumptions are governing this section. Availability is not just about phasing. It should also include the land ownership issue that you have place in the Achievability section	See paragraph 6.24
Achievability: Shouldn't this include comments on potential viability, particularly where the site is brownfield and requiring expensive remedial works? It should also make some reference to local market conditions	See paragraph 6.25
The achievability of the site is assessed in terms of economic viability	
It would be inappropriate to hold back ADR land from development in the earliest phases of the Redditch LDF simply because it is currently designated as ADR	Since this comment received, WYG has suggested that the ADRs in Redditch Borough are less favourable housing options than Green Belt land in Bromsgrove district. Redditch Borough Council is not, at this stage, including a provision for housing on ADR land within the SHLAA

Appendix 6

Comments received on density multipliers and net developable areas and any actions taken with respect to updating the criteria

Contact: Mrs A Grimmett
Extn: 3209
alison.grimmett@redditchbc.gov.uk

21 May 2008

Dear Sir,

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

Thank you for the interest you have shown regarding the SHLAA for Redditch. I will shortly be carrying out site assessments. To make this process more straightforward, a draft Site Assessment Form has been designed and will be completed for each site.

At this stage, I would be grateful for any comments that you may have on the draft Site Assessment Form by Friday 30 May 2008. I will then be able to make any required changes before site assessment begins.


I have attached a draft Appraisal Summary Table and an explanation of the assessment process for your information. Any comments on these would also be welcome.

I would also like your comments on two additional issues (some comments have already been submitted by interested parties).

- i) Density multipliers – as part of the assessment, I need to assess potential yield for each site. As modelling would prove very time consuming, I am aiming to apply density multipliers based on Policy B(HSG).4 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 (i.e. 30 to 50 dph in the urban area and Redditch settlements and about 70 dph within the Town Centre or District Centres).
- ii) Net developable areas – I will need to make allowances for infrastructure provision on new sites and would like to propose the following:
Sites up to 0.4ha – 100% of site area used
Sites 0.4ha to 2 ha – 80% of site area used
Sites 2 ha and over – 60% of site area used

Once again, thank you for the interest you have shown in the SHLAA and I look forward to receiving any comments you may have. If you have any queries in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully



Alison Grimmett TechRTP
Planning Officer

Consultees – Draft Site Appraisal Form

Company	Title	Initials	Surname	Print	Post /Email
	MR	D L	HATTERSLEY	Y	P
	MS	K	WILSON	Y	P
	MR	M J S	COCKBURN	Y	P
	MR	A	GOLDRICK	Y	P
	MR	L	CROMPTON	Y	P
	MR	R	KENDALL	Y	P
ALAN SMITH ASSOC.				Y	P
ATISREAL	MR	A	MORGAN	Y	P
DAVID WILSON HOMES	MR	D	CHEAL	Y	P
ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS	MR	S	WILLBY	Y	P
MILLER HOMES WEST MIDLANDS				Y	P
PERSIMMON HOMES (SOUTH MIDLANDS) L	MR	C	MAY	Y	P
RED RESPONSE PROPERTY	MR	K	OCONNOR	Y	P
STEVE HASKEY DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION	MR	S	HASKEY	Y	P
SUNRISE PROPERTIES		M S	FAROOQUI	Y	P

Record: 1 of 15

Company	Title	Initials	Surname	Print	Post /Email
STRATFORD-ON-AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL	MR	C	STAVES	Y	P
WORCESTERSHIRE PRIMARY CARE TRUST	MR	N	HIGENBOTTAM	Y	P

Company	Title	Initials	Surname	Email
RPS	MS	C	MUSTON	carol.muston@rpsgroup.com
GVA GRIMLEY LTD	MR	R	GARDNER	robert.gardner@gvagrimley.co.uk
HOME BUILDERS FEDERATION	MR	T	WATTON	tim.watton@hbf.co.uk
BARTON WILMORE PLANNING	MS	K	VENTHAM	kathryn.ventham@bartonwillmore.com
BIGWOOD CHARTERED SURVEYORS	MR	C M	TOTNEY	ctotney@bigwood.uk.com
HARRIS LAMB	MS	C	OSBORN	claire.osborn@harrislamb.com
CB RICHARD ELLIS	MR	A	BOWE	andrew.bowe@cbre.com
FISHER GERMAN	MR	A	MAYELL	anthony.mayell@fishergerman.co.uk
DRS DEVELOPMENTS	MR	D	SANDERS	contact@drsdevelopments.co.uk
NEIL SHEPHERD DESIGN LTD	MR	N	SHEPHERD	nop_shepherd@yahoo.co.uk
HOUSING CORPORATION	MS	C	SEATON	Christine.Seaton@housingcorp.gs
PRIORY ASSET LTD	MR	S	GRUNDY	info@prioryasset.co.uk
DS DESIGNS LTD		D	SAUNDERS	reb_dar@btinternet.com
WILLIAM DAVIS LTD	MR	J	COLEMAN	john.coleman@williamdavis.co.uk
	MR	N	EDMONDS	beoleyequestrian@hotmail.com
SAVILLS		R	WELLS	rwells@savills.com
	MR	I	GREENFELL	igreen@aol.com
	MR	M	WRIGHT	ann.wright12@btinternet.com
BARNETT TAYLOR ASSOC.	MR	R	TAYLOR	barnetttaylor@tiscali.co.uk
HARRIS LAMB	MR	S	HAWLEY	simon.hawley@harrislamb.com
NIGEL POOLE & MCGINN				nigelpooleuk@yahoo.co.uk
	MR	I	WILLCOCK	anthony.ivan@btconnect.com
	MR	D	JONES	rdjones@hotmail.co.uk
HOME BUILDERS FEDERATION	MS	C	ABBOTT	charlotte.abbott@hbf.co.uk

Record: 1 of 24

Company	Title	Initials	Surname	Email
ENGLISH HERITAGE	MISS	A	SMITH	amanda.smith@english-heritage.org.uk

MR D L HATTERSLEY
BROADACRES FARM, BIRMINGHAM ROAD
MAPPLEBOROUGH GREEN
REDDITCH
WORCS B80 7BH

P

MS K WILSON
62 LINEHOLT CLOSE,
OAKENSHAW SOUTH
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 7YU

P

MR M J S COCKBURN
OLD YARR, BLAZE LANE

FECKENHAM
WORCS B96 6AQ

P

MR A GOLDRICK
TOOKEYS FARMHOUSE, TOOKEYS DRIVE
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6BB

P

MR L CROMPTON
1 PURSHALL CLOSE,
SOUTHCREST
REDDITCH
WORCS B97 4PD

P

MR R KENDALL
THE HAVEN, BANKS GREEN NURSERIES
UPPER BENTLEY
NR REDDITCH
WORCS B97 5SU

P

ALAN SMITH ASSOC.
2 MILL LANE,
FECKENHAM
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6HY

P

ATISREAL
MR A MORGAN
9 COLMORE ROW,

BIRMINGHAM
B3 2BJ

P

DAVID WILSON HOMES
MR D CHEAL SENIOR LAND MANAGER
ENTERPRISE HOUSE, PENDEFORD BUSINESS PARK
WOBASTON ROAD
PENDERFORD
WOLVERHAMPTON WV9 5HA

P

ENGLISH PARTNERSHIPS
MR S WILLBY PRINCIPAL PLANNING OFFICER
JORDAN HOUSE WEST, HALL PARK
HALL PARK WAY
TELFORD
SHROPS TF3 4NN

P

MILLER HOMES WEST MIDLANDS
6060 KNIGHTS COURT, SOLIHULL PARKWAY
BIRMINGHAM BUSINESS PARK
SOLIHULL
B37 7WY

P

PERSIMMON HOMES (SOUTH MIDLANDS) LTD
MR C MAY STRATEGIC LAND MANAGER
PERSIMMON HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM ROAD

STUDLEY
WARKS B80 7BG

P

RED RESPONSE PROPERTY
MR K OCONNOR
17 AVENUE ROAD,
ASTWOOD BANK
REDDITCH
WORCS B96 6AH

P

STEVE HASKEY DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION LTD
MR S HASKEY
18 ST JOHN STREET,
BROMSGROVE
WORCS B61 8QY

P

SUNRISE PROPERTIES
M S FAROOQUI
3 MEADOW HILL ROAD,
RIVERSIDE
REDDITCH
WORCS B98 8HN

P

STRATFORD-ON-AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL
MR C STAVES
ELIZABETH HOUSE, CHURCH STREET
STRATFORD-UPON-AVON
WARKS CV37 6HX

P

WORCESTERSHIRE PRIMARY CARE TRUST
MR N HIGENBOTTAM
GROUND FLOOR, WEST WING, WILDWOOD
WILDWOOD DRIVE
WORCESTER
WR5 2LG

P

Comment	Redditch Borough Council Response
Density multipliers:	
Have these been substantiated by densities on recent sites in the town? We have several examples of town centre sites which are achieving net densities of over 100 dph. Your 70 dph town centre multiplier may understate capacity	See paragraph 6.18
Density multipliers should be increased to 50 dph in the Redditch urban area and a minimum of 70 dph in the Centres	See paragraphs 6.19 and 7.10
A Blanket approach to residential densities is not appropriate. Suggest use information from schemes/ applications or typical layouts from elsewhere	
We believe density multipliers based on Policy B(HSG).4 are appropriate	
Net developable area:	
Your suggestions reflect "Tapping the Potential" but this does not work when the most suitable future for a site is in the form of mixed uses with residential covering a relatively small proportion of the site. You may find that this is a particular issue with sites currently in employment use where retention of part of the site for employment uses is likely to be sought	See paragraphs 6.20 and 7.10
Allowances for infrastructure provision are too high for the larger site of 2Ha and over and therefore propose that 70% of the site should be used. For sites 0.4 Ha to 2 Ha 85% of the site should be used	
100% housing on the smallest sites is optimistic. I think a better figure would be 90%	
We agree with your apportionment of the developable areas	
We have no objections to the proposed density multipliers	

Appendix 7

Windfall calculation

Urban Brownfield Completions on sites of less than 5 dwellings												
96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	Total
17	11	24	16	13	21	16	17	18	24	20	24	221

~~221~~ divided by 12 = ~~18.4~~ (rounded to ~~18~~ dwellings)

~~18~~ dwellings x ~~15~~ years (April ~~11~~ to March 26) = ~~270~~ dwellings

Small site windfall allowance on sites less than 5 dwellings = ~~270~~ dwellings

Deleted: 286

Deleted: 23.8

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 24

Deleted: 18

Deleted: 08

Deleted: 432

Formatted: Left

Deleted: 432

Appendix 8

Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information

(sites in grey to be carried forward for further assessment)

(sites in yellow to be carried forward for assessment by White Young Green)

Local Plan Commitments at 1 April 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
LP01	Old Crest, Smallwood (LP 83)	Carry forward
LP02	Brush Factory, Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross (LP124)	Carry forward
LP03	Rear of 144-162 Easemore Road (LP135)	Carry forward
LP04	Land at former Mega Bowl site (LP140)	Carry forward
LP05	Windsor Gas Works (LP147)	Carry forward
LP06	Mayfields Works (06/187)	Carry forward
LP07	Johnsons Cars, Clive Road (06/247)	Carry forward
LP08	Grange Works (06/494)	Carry forward
LP09	Adjacent Rockhill Farm (07/005)	Carry forward
LP10	Walton Close (07/275)	Carry forward
LP11	Community House, Easemore Road (05/301ol)	Carry forward
LP12	1184-6 Evesham Road, Astwood Bank (05/480)	Carry forward
LP13	Land off Torrs Close (06/371)	Carry forward
LP14	20 Unicorn Hill/Bates Hill (07/168)	This site falls within the Church Road SPD site area and as such the site has been removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
LP15	Adjacent The Lodge, Pool Bank (07/201)	Carry forward
LP16	Land at Tidbury Close (07/214)	Carry forward

Local Plan No.3 sites to meet potential housing requirement shortfalls

Deleted: target

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
LPX01	Rear of 1-11 Auxerre Avenue	Site to be merged with UCS 8.38
LPX02	Adjacent Castleditch Lane / Pheasant Lane	Site to be assessed
LPX03	Prospect Hill	Site to be assessed
LPX04	Former Claybrook School, Matchborough	Site to be assessed
LPX05	Land at Millfields, RO Fire Station	Site to be assessed
LPX06	Former Ipsley School playing field	Site to be assessed
LPX07	South of scout hut, Oakenshaw Road	Site to be assessed

Planning Permissions granted after 1 April 2008

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
PP01	Red Lion PH, Church Road, Astwood Bank (08/109)	Carry forward

Deleted: 08/109

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 Omission Sites

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
1	Expansion of first deposit housing site 99b – Land at Church Road, Webheath to include Vicarage	Current LP commitment
2	Brockhill Area of Development Restraint (ADR) west of the railway line	Picked up as ADR
3	Land at Weights Lane	Picked up as ADR
4	Land north of Windsor road (Mettis Aerospace)	Submitted site
5	Area of Primarily Open Space at Brockhill between the ADR and existing Brockhill Development	Within submitted site
6	Homer Factory site	Submitted site
7	Land at Love Lyne	Part of submitted site
8	Land off Whitehouse Lane	Parkland – large open space deficit in this area
9	Land off Union Street	Developed
10	Land at Broadacres Farm (ADR)	Submitted site
11	Webheath ADR	Picked up as ADR

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
12	Highfield House	Designated employment land – suggest assessment in employment land review in first instance
13	Land to the north of Highfield House	Part employment land designation – suggest assessment in employment land review in first instance
14	Former Claybrook First School playing fields	Additional LP3 site
15	Woodyard Garage, Church Road	Within Webheath ADR

Draft Preferred Core Strategy Strategic Sites

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
CS01	Church Hill District Centre	Site to be assessed
CS02	Winyates District Centre	Site to be assessed
CS03	Matchborough District Centre	Site to be assessed
CS04	Woodrow District Centre	Site to be assessed

Supplementary Planning Documents

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
	Church Hill District Centre	Picked up from Core Strategy Strategic Sites
	Prospect Hill	Picked up under additional LP3 sites
	Edward Street	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
	Land to the rear of Alexandra Hospital	This site will only be considered for housing if employment land review considers it surplus to employment land supply

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
	Church Road	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
	Auxerre Avenue	Picked up under additional LP3 sites

White Young Green Joint Study Sites

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
WYG01	Hewell Road Baths	Site to be assessed
	Widney House Works	Picked up under submitted sites
WYG02	Peterbrook Close	Site to be assessed
	Leacroft Road	Site needed for car parking associated with development at Leacroft Road
WYG03	Tanhouse Lane	Site to be assessed
	Mordiford Close	Land subject to Estate Enhancement works to provide landscaping and additional car parking
WYG04	Marlfield Farm School	Site to be assessed
	Church Road	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date

Deleted: Land 4 Leisure

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
	Edward Street	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
	Church Hill Centre	SPD site / Strategic site
	Prospect Hill	SPD site / Strategic site
	Alexandra Hospital	This site will only be considered for housing if ELR considers it surplus to employment land supply
WYG05	Fire Station, Birmingham Road	Site to be assessed
	Matchborough Centre	Picked up under Core Strategy strategic sites
WYG06	High Trees, Dark Lane	Site to be assessed

National Land Use Database

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
182500002	Gas Works, Windsor Road, Enfield	Picked up as current housing commitment
182500003	Land at Woolaston Road, Park Farm North	ELR to assess site
182500004	Buildings at Edward Street, Enfield	Picked up as an SPD site
182500006	Gas Works, Windsor Road, Enfield	ELR to assess site
182500007	Former Sewage Works adjacent to Crossgate Depot	ELR to assess site
182500009	Former marble works, Crossgate Road	ELR to assess site
182500013	Old Crest, South Street, Smallwood	Picked up as current housing commitment
182500041	Railway Goods Yard, Hewell Road, Enfield	Site complete 07/08
182500043	Sewage Works, Pumphouse Lane, Webheath	Picked up within Webheath ADR
182500044	Sewage Works, Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Picked up as submitted site
182500047	Rear of 1-11 Auxerre Avenue, Greenlands	Picked up as additional LP3 site

Site Reference	Site Address / Name	Remarks on suitability
182500048	Land at former Megabowl, Greenlands Drive	Picked up as LP3 site

Submitted Sites

Site Reference	Submitted by	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
RB01	DRS Developments (UK) Ltd	Windmill Cottage, Callow Hill Lane	Site to be assessed
RB02	DRS Developments (UK) Ltd	Wellington Works, Astwood Bank	Below site size threshold
RB03	Neil Shepherd Design Ltd (Agent)	Widney House, Bromsgrove Road	Site to be assessed
RB04	M Farooqui	RO 29-33 Glover Street	Below site size threshold
RB05	M Farooqui	Unit 5, Hewell Road	ELR to assess
RB06	A Goldrick	Land between Tookeys Farmhouse and Doebank House, Astwood Bank	Site to be assessed
RB07	Neil Shepherd Design Ltd (Agent)	RO 128-146 Bromsgrove Road	Site to be assessed
RB08	Fisher German LLP (Agent)	Land at Astwood Lane, Astwood Bank	Site to be assessed
RB09	Bigwood Chartered Surveyors (Agent)	Land rear of hospital	ELR to assess
RB10	Harris Lamb (Agent)	East of Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross	Site to be assessed
RB11	Harris Lamb (Agent)	Land south of the Slough and east of Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross	Site to be assessed
RB12	Harris Lamb (Agent)	Land north of Love Lyne	Site to be assessed
RB13	Harris Lamb (Agent)	Land off Dagnell End Road	Site to be assessed
RB14	Harris Lamb (Agent)	Driving range, Dagnell End Road	Site to be assessed
RB15	Harris Lamb (Agent)	Land off Rush Lane	Site to be assessed
RB16	RPS Planning (Agent)	Brockhill	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB17	RPS Planning (Agent)	Brockhill	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB18	RPS Planning (Agent)	Brockhill	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB19	Barton Willmore Planning (Agent)	Webheath	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB20	GVA Grimley (Agent)	A453	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB21	GVA Grimley (Agent)	A435	ADR – to be assessed by WYG

Site Reference	Submitted by	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
RB22	Nigel Poole & McGinn (Agent)	Land off Gorsey Close, Astwood Bank	Site to be assessed
RB23	Harris Lamb (Agent)	Clive Works, Bromsgrove Road	Part of Edwards Street site. Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
RB24	K Wilson	The White House, Astwood Lane	Site to be assessed
RB25	D Hattersley	A435	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB26	GVA Grimley (Agent)	A435	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB27	GVA Grimley (Agent)	A435	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB28	GVA Grimley (Agent)	A435	ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB29	D S Designs Ltd (Agent)	Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Site to be assessed
RB30	D S Designs Ltd (Agent)	Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Site to be assessed
RB31	D S Designs Ltd (Agent)	Blaze Lane, Hunt End	Site to be assessed
RB32	CBRE (Agent)	Mettis Aerospace, Windsor Road	ELR to assess
RB33	M Farooqui	36-40 Marsden Road and 74, 72 South Street & 9 Beaufort Street	Below site size threshold
RB34	David Jones (Agent)	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Site to be assessed
RB35	David Jones (Agent)	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Site to be assessed
RB36	David Jones (Agent)	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Site to be assessed
RB37	David Jones (Agent)	Redditch Golf Club, Webheath	Site to be assessed
RB38	L. Brian King (Agent)	102-110 Bromsgrove Road	Site to be assessed
RB39	Richard Crook (Agent)	Four Winds, Mappleborough Green	A435 ADR – to be assessed by WYG
RB40	A Willcock	Brockhill Drive	In vicinity of wider Brockhill development – to be assessed by WYG

Formatted Table

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
L4L01	Land off Banners Lane	Site to be assessed
L4L02	Land off Wirehill Drive	Site to be assessed
L4L03	Land at Loxley Close	Site to be assessed
L4L04	Land at Skilts Avenue	Site to be assessed
L4L05	Land at Lingen Close	Below site size threshold

Urban Capacity Study

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS1.1	Land between Bromsgrove Highway, Salters Lane and Foxlydiate Wood	Green Belt and LNR
UCS 1.2	Land at Pitcheroak Wood fronting Bromsgrove Road	SWS and LNR
UCS 1.3	Sports ground rear of Poplar Road and Cherry Tree Walk	Well used pitches. Also, terraced housing along length of this site – would prohibit football use if half of the site was used for housing as it would not be possible to fit pitch on either side.
UCS 1.4	Cricket ground off Bromsgrove Road	Sports pitch – see para. 15 PPG17
UCS 1.5	Allotments adjacent to Valley Stadium	Allotments
UCS 1.6	Land off Bordesley Lane	May form part of AS development therefore excluded from SHLAA
UCS 1.7	Land rear of Redditch Fire Station	Picked up as additional LP3 site
UCS 1.8	Land at Tilehouse / rear of St.Lukes Infant School	Well used allotment site
UCS 1.9	Land at Torrs Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 1.10	Land fronting Pool Bank	LNR and SWS
UCS 1.11	Land at Ashperton Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 1.12	Land between Foredrift Close and Coldfield Drive	No access
UCS 1.13	Land fronting Salters Lane – north of Batchley Pool	Batchley Park
UCS 1.14	Land at Tunnel Drive and Greenfields	Limited open space within this Ward. Garages have been redeveloped.
UCS 1.15	Foxlydiate Wood	SWS
UCS 1.16	Land at western end of Salters Lane	Site to be assessed

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 1.17	Land at Brockhill	Developed
UCS 1.18	Garages off Ash Tree Road	Developed
UCS 1.19	Land at Batchley Pool	Batchley pool park
UCS 1.20	Land rear of Batchley shops	Site merged with UCS 1.55
UCS 1.21	Land fronting Bromsgrove Road – Foxlydiate Wood	SWS and LNR
UCS 1.22	Land rear of Mount Pleasant and the Mayfields	Developed
UCS 1.23	Land between Torrs Close and the Mayfields	Rear garden
UCS 1.24	Garages off Greenfields	Site has been approved for 2 dwellings.
UCS 1.25	Land off Greenfields	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.26	Land between Highfields House and Hollowfields Close	LNR and SWS
UCS 1.27	Garages off Monks Path	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.28	Garages between Hawthorn Road and Foxlydiate Crescent	Access to garages at rear of gardens would result in a net area below site size threshold.
UCS 1.29	Land at Pine Tree Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.30	Corner of Rowan Road	Visibility splay
UCS 1.31	Rear of Church, Rowan Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.32	Land off Rowan Crescent	Local authority value
UCS 1.33	Land fronting Salters Lane, near to junction with Foxlydiate Crescent	Rear gardens
UCS 1.34	In front of Poplar Road shops	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.35	Rear of Poplar Road shops	Investigate garages as well
UCS 1.36	Land fronting poplar Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.37	Corner of Poplar Road / Bromsgrove Road	Visibility splay. Below site size threshold.
UCS 1.38	Rear of three storey flats	Developed
UCS 1.39	Sports ground, rear of Poplar Road / Cherry Tree Walk	See 1.3
UCS 1.40	Land at HDA Social Club	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.41	Car Park, HDA Social Club	Car park for associated sports and leisure facilities
UCS 1.42	HDA cricket pitch and pavilion	Sports facility – see para. 15 PPG17
UCS 1.43	Batchley First School playing fields	School Playing Field
UCS 1.44	Corner of Cherry Tree Walk and Foxlydiate Crescent	Site to be assessed
UCS 1.45	Land at Beech Tree Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.46	Batchley Pool	Batchley Park Pool
UCS 1.47	Batchley Road, opposite entrance to Bridley Moor School	Below site size threshold
UCS 1.48	Entrance to Bridley Moor High School	Access to Pulman Close
UCS 1.49	Queens Head P.H. car park	Developed

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 1.50	Land rear of Bromsgrove Road – industrial buildings	Site to be assessed
UCS 1.51	Bentley Close allotments	Allotments
UCS 1.52	Torrs Close	Developed
UCS 1.53	Central reservation at Batchley Road shops	Part of Batchley Park Pool openness
UCS 1.54	The Brockhill P.H.	Site to be assessed
UCS 1.55	Land to the side of Batchley Road shops (site merged with site 1.20: land rear of Batchley Road shops)	Site merged with UCS 1.20
UCS 1.56	Works – rear of properties fronting Bromsgrove Road	Site put forward by owner therefore already in assessment
UCS 1.57	Valley Stadium	Sports facility
UCS 1.58	Edward Street	Site removed from SHLAA at this stage as Retail Needs Assessment indicates that this land would be suitable to meet Redditch's retail needs. Some housing may be accommodated but only as a secondary land use. Further assessment will take place at a later date
UCS 1.59	Land at Hewell Road	Developed
UCS 1.60	Hewell Road Swimming Baths	Picked up under WYG Study
UCS 1.61	Corner of Hewell Road / Windsor Road	Employment land therefore not assessed
UCS 1.62	Land at Windsor Road, Gas Works	Existing LP3 housing site and part employment
UCS 1.63	Land at Windsor Road, Gas Works adjacent IN24	Existing LP3 housing site
UCS 1.64	Land rear of fire station	Additional LP3 housing site
UCS 1.65	Land at Abbey Stadium	Sports facility subject to major redevelopment opportunities
UCS 1.66	Land rear of The Cedars nursing home	Developed
UCS 1.67	Land at Marston Minor, The Mayfields	Developed
UCS 2.1	Land north of Pumphouse Lane	Developed
UCS 2.2	Land south of Pumphouse Lane / north of Crumpfields Lane	Picked up as ADR
UCS 2.3	Redditch Golf Course	Sports facility – see para.15 PPG17
UCS 2.4	Land at Callow Hill	Developed
UCS 2.5	Land fronting Callow Hill Lane	Woodland buffer between estate and Callow Hill Lane

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 2.6	Land fronting Callow Hill Lane	Woodland buffer between estate and Callow Hill Lane
UCS 2.7	Land at junction of Foxholes Lane / Callow Hill Lane	Woodland buffer between estate and Callow Hill Lane
UCS 2.8	Land at junction of Foxholes Lane / Callow Hill Lane	Site size below threshold
UCS 2.9	Morton Stanley Park	Well used park. Partly covered by SWS and LNR. Green Flag award in place
UCS 2.10	Land fronting Foxlydiate Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 2.11	Land bound by Bromsgrove Highway and Birchfield Road	SWS and LNR
UCS 2.12	Land opposite Foxlydiate Hotel	Green Belt land – development of this site is not in a suitable location to be incorporated into longer term growth options beyond Redditch on neighbouring Green Belt land
UCS 2.13	Land off Foxlydiate Lane	Developed
UCS 2.14	Land adjacent Saltways Cheshire Home	Site to be assessed
UCS 2.15	Land off Springvale Road	Site to be assessed
UCS 2.16	Rear of Sandygate Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 2.17	Land off Lyndenwood Close	Site size below threshold
UCS 2.18	Land off Boxnott Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 2.19	South-western area of MSP	LNR
UCS 2.20	LP 51	Developed
UCS 3.1	Corner of Birchfield Road / Middle Piece Drive	Site size below threshold
UCS 3.2	Land off Charles Street fronting Birchfield Road / Middle Piece Drive	Site size below threshold
UCS 3.3	Rear of The Archers P.H., Feckenham Road	Site to be assessed
UCS 3.4	Head of Burns Close, Headless Cross	Developed
UCS 3.5	Headless Cross Centre	Committee resolution to invest in area for the benefit of Headless Cross residents for open space uses
UCS 3.6	Bottom of Feckenham Road, Headless Cross	Garden land / highway buffer
UCS 3.7	Land off Leacroft Road	Site size below threshold
UCS 3.8	Land off Leacroft Road	L4L - site capacity below threshold
UCS 3.9	Land off Leacroft Road	Picked up under WYG Study sites
UCS 3.10	Land off Priestfield Road	Site to be assessed

Formatted Table

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 3.11	Land off Banners Lane	Play area
UCS 3.12	Land off Banners Lane	Developed
UCS 3.13	Land off Banners Lane	Picked up under Assets Disposal
UCS 3.14	Land off Stonepits Lane	Stonepits Copse – heavily wooded
UCS 3.15	Land off Weavers Hill	Developed
UCS 3.16	Land off Weavers Hill	Balancing area
UCS 3.17	Land at Chesterton Close	Developed
UCS 3.18	Land off Evesham Road	Developed
UCS 3.19	Land off Evesham Road	Developed
UCS 3.20	Land off Evesham Road	Developed
UCS 3.21	Land between Windmill Drive and Love Lyne / Tippings Hill	Part of site in Callow Hill Ridge area – this part excluded from assessment
UCS 3.22	Land off Hunt End Lane	Assess part of site only as remainder is heavily wooded
UCS 3.23	Land off Hunt End Lane	Merge with UCS 3.24. Assess part of site only as remainder is heavily wooded
UCS 3.24	Land of Hunt End Lane	Merge with UCS 3.23. Assess part of site only as remainder is heavily wooded
UCS 3.25	Land off Hunt End Lane	Balancing area
UCS 3.26	Land off Peterbrook Close	Picked up under WYG Study
UCS 3.27	Land rear of Peterbrook Close	
UCS 3.28	Land at junction of Castleditch Lane and Pheasant Lane	Picked up as additional LP3 site
UCS 3.29	Land at Forest View	Developed
UCS 3.30	Land at Forest View	Below site size threshold
UCS 3.31	Land off Crabbs Cross Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 3.32	Land off Crabbs Cross Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 3.33	Land off Leacroft Road	No access to land
UCS 3.34	Land south of Stonepits	Heavily wooded area; previous information suggests thinning badger population
UCS 3.35	Land between Callow Hill Lane and Love Lyne	Callow Hill Ridge
UCS 3.36	Land between Windmill Drive and Love Lyne	Developed
UCS 3.37	Land southwest of Dunlop Road Industrial estate	Balancing area
UCS 3.38	Playing field off Birchfield Road	Playing area and well used football pitches
UCS 3.39	Land off Swinburne Road	Committee recommendation to invest in area for the benefit of Headless Cross residents for open space uses

Deleted: Land 4 Leisure

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 3.40	Land off Coleshill Close	Heavily wooded
UCS 3.41	Land south of Feckenham Road	Committee recommendation to invest in area for the benefit of Headless Cross residents for open space uses
UCS 3.42	Land south of Walkwood School playing field	Site to be assessed
UCS 3.43	Land east of Longfellow Close	Site partially wooded, consider open area beyond hammerhead of Longfellow Close only
UCS 3.44	Rear of Hanover Court	Heavily wooded, very steep
UCS 3.45	Land off Windmill Drive	Highway verge
UCS 3.46	Land between Windmill Drive and The Wharrage	Wooded open space; flooding risk
UCS 3.47	Land off Rough Hill Drive	Steep and wooded
UCS 3.48	Rear of Dorothy Terry Red Cross House, Evesham Road	Developed
UCS 3.49	Car park / bottle bank	Site to be assessed
UCS 3.50	LP 41	Developed
UCS 3.51	LP 88	Developed
UCS 3.52	Land off Rectory Road	Developed
UCS 3.53	Land off Plymouth Road North	Developed
UCS 4.1	Land north of Meadow Farm P.H.	Site to be assessed
UCS 4.2	Land southwest of Meadow Farm P.H.	Site to be assessed
UCS 4.3	Land off Easemore Road / rear of Meadow Hill Crescent	Developed
UCS 4.4	Dagnell End Road, opposite Dagnell End Farm etc.	Site completely within flood zone
UCS 4.5	Rear of Forge Mill Road, off Church Hill Way	Ancient monument site
UCS 4.6	Land north of Dolphin Road, south of Church Hill Way	Site to be assessed
UCS 4.7	Land fronting Dagnell End Road by Icknield Street crossroads	Heavily planted buffer
UCS 4.8	Land between Marshfield Close and Hither Green Lane Golf Course	Wooded and important to AVP
UCS 4.9	Land at Paper Mill Hill	Width of linear aspect of AVP would be compromised by development of this site
UCS 4.10	Land between Brooklands Lane and Church Hill Way	Width of linear aspect of AVP would be compromised by development of this site
UCS 4.11	Land off Paper Mill Drive - allotments	Width of linear aspect of AVP would be compromised by development of this site

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 4.12	Land off Paper Mill Drive – opposite allotments	Allotments
UCS 4.13	Woodland off Paper Mill Drive	Wooded park land; steep
UCS 4.14	Land off Ravensbank Drive, opposite Home Meadow Lane	Consider as part of site for growth beyond Redditch
UCS 4.15	Land at roundabout, opposite Rickyard Lane	ELR to assess
UCS 4.16	North of North Moons Moat	SWS
UCS 4.17	Land southwest of North Moons Moat	ELR to assess
UCS 4.18	Land opposite IN23 (southeast of North Moons Moat)	Developed
UCS 4.19	Land of Millrace Road	Heavily wooded
UCS 4.20	Land east of Meadow Farm P.H.	Pick up as Submitted Site
UCS 4.21	Land in Arrow Valley Park	Development of this site would compromise the width of the linear nature of AVP
UCS 4.22	Marfield Farm playing field	Merged with WYG 04
UCS 4.23	Moons Moat playing field	School playing field
UCS 4.24	Land east of 'Moons Moat' archaeological site	Site completely within flood zone
UCS 4.25	Land east of Loxley Close	Within flood zone and wooded buffer between conflicting land uses
UCS 4.26	Land east of Northfield Close	Within flood zone and wooded buffer between conflicting land uses
UCS 4.27	Land east of Hillmorton Close, Fairford Close	Wooded buffer between conflicting land uses
UCS 4.28	Land opposite north of North Moons Moat	SWS
UCS 4.29	Land adjacent to Istel, southeast of North Moons Moat	ELR to assess
UCS 4.30	Adjacent to Oast House P.H / DSM land	ELR to assess
UCS 4.31	Land off Tanhouse Lane	Picked up under WYG Study
UCS 4.32	Land at Berkswell Close	Issue with Great Crested Newts therefore excluded at this stage
UCS 4.33	Parkland north of Marfield Farm School	Parkland
UCS 4.34	Land at Edgeworth Close / Marfield Lane	Parkland and play area
UCS 4.35	Land south of Marfield Farm school playing field	Parkland and play area
UCS 4.36	Land between Brooklands Lane and Offenham Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 4.36(b)	Land south of Brooklands Lane	Investigate eastern part of site

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 4.37	Land off Radway Close / Rush Lane	Development at this site would compromise public access into AVP
UCS 4.38	Papermill Farm	Recently renovated
UCS 4.39	Rear of Forge Mill Road, off Church Hill Way	Too close to Bordesley Abbey SAM
UCS 4.40	Rear of Easemore Road	Existing LP3 site
UCS 4.41	Land at Sedgeley Close – Local Plan site 55	Developed
UCS 4.42	Dolphin Road	Pre-fabs, possible future LB
UCS 4.43	Land north of Dolphin Road fronting Church Hill Way	Partially wooded and partially in flood zone
UCS 4.44	Land at Tanhouse Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 4.45	Land at Knowle Close	Falls within Church Hill SPD area
UCS 4.46	Loxley Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 4.47	Land off Thornhill Road, North Moons Moat	ELR to assess
UCS 4.48	Part of LP site IN1	Developed
UCS 4.49	IN34	ELR to assess
UCS 4.50	Part of IN4	Within flood zone and would form part of employment land review
UCS 4.51	Part of IN4	ELR to assess
UCS 4.52	IN33	Developed
UCS 4.53	IN6 and additional land (53a, 53b)	ELR to assess
UCS 4.54	Land north of Istel fronting Ravensbank Drive	ELR to assess
UCS 4.55	Opposite 20 Oakridge Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 4.56	Side of 9 Donnington Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 4.57	Side of 40 Donnington Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 4.58	Side of 13 Northfield Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 4.59	Land off Fringe Meadow Road	ELR to assess
UCS 5.1	Land at Melen Street – part of LP site 89 (TC5A)	Developed
UCS 5.2	Land adjacent to Mr Pizza, Bromsgrove Road – part of LP site 89 (TC5A)	Below site size threshold
UCS 5.3	Land off South Street	Developed
UCS 5.4	Old Crest, South Street – LP Site 83	Picked up under LP3 sites
UCS 5.5	Old railway line off Tunnel Drive	Heavily wooded
UCS 5.6	Land off Albert Street includes part of LP site IN23	Part developed, part picked up under Additional LP3 sites
UCS 5.7	Land at Hemmings entry, rear of Melen Street / Abbey Road	Ringway embankment – too steep
UCS 5.8	Railway Goods Yard site – LP 89 (TC5A)	Developed

Formatted Table

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 5.9	Abbey High School playing fields	School playing fields
UCS 5.10	S.E. quadrant (part of bomb site) – LP site IN44	Developed
UCS 5.11	Part of S.E. quadrant site – land between Grove Street and Ringway (merged with 5.10)	Developed
UCS 5.12	Land off Holloway lane – part of LP site IN42	Developed
UCS 5.13	Rear of Southmead Crescent – part of LP site IN42 (merged with 5.12)	Developed
UCS 5.14	Alcad redevelopment site	Developed
UCS 5.15	Land off Albert Street (merged with 5.6)	Part developed for car parking, remainder picked up under Additional LP3 sites
UCS 5.16	Land off Birmingham Road, opposite Abbey Road (merged with 5.6)	Picked up under Additional LP3 sites
UCS 5.17	Land off Fishing Line Road	ELR to assess
UCS 5.18	Railway Goods Yard (Car Park)	Railway station car park
UCS 5.19	Land off Easemore Road	Part of site suitable for development, with OL pp therefore already included for assessment
UCS 5.20	Land off Lady Harriet's Lane	Site to be assessed
UCS 5.21	Church Road Bus Depot	Picked up under SPD sites
UCS 5.22	Land off Bates Hill	Picked up under SPD sites
UCS 5.23	Unicorn P.H.	Developed
UCS 5.24	Shop units fronting Royal Square	Developed
UCS 5.25	S.E. quadrant (part) – LP site IN44	Car park for college
UCS 5.26	S.E. quadrant (part) land fronting Alcester Street – LP site IN44 (merged with 5.10)	Developed
UCS 5.27	S.E. quadrant (part) land adjacent Palace Theatre – LP site IN44 (merged with 5.10)	Developed
UCS 5.28	S.E. quadrant (part) land opposite Palace Theatre (merged with 5.10)	Developed
UCS 5.29	Land at the end of Mount Street (merged with 5.3)	Developed
UCS 5.30	Land rear of Sterling Save, Summer Street	ELR to assess
UCS 5.31	ESSO station, Ringway	Developed
UCS 5.32	Land rear of Scout Hut, Beoley Road West	Employment units and parking for scout hut
UCS 5.33	Stevenson Avenue – LP site 87	Church land – will not release for development
UCS 5.34	Land around Terrys factory (part of IN42) (merged with 5.12)	Developed
UCS 5.36	Bingo Hall, Church Road	Picked up under SPD sites

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 5.37	Car Park 7, Church Road	Picked up under SPD sites
UCS 5.38	Land at Redditch Cinema, Unicorn Hill / Bates Hill	Picked up under SPD sites
UCS 6.1	Land in AVP adjacent to Marlfield Lane and Proctors Barn Lane	Partly LNR. Development of this site would delete linear aspect of AVP
UCS 6.2	Land off Brook Street	Showman's quarters
UCS 6.3	Land fronting Holloway Drive opposite / adjacent to Arrow Road	Allotments
UCS 6.4	Land at St.Bedes School	School playing field
UCS 6.5	Land south of Lodge Pool	Land prominent to openness of Lodge Pool parkland
UCS 6.6	Land off Wirehill Drive	Picked up under Assets Disposal
UCS 6.7	Land off Holloway Drive and Huins Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 6.8	Land at Arrow Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 6.9	Land off Brook Street	Developed
UCS 6.10	Land between Sandon Close and Holloway Drive	Site to be assessed
UCS 6.11	Land off Kingsley Avenue	Below site size threshold
UCS 6.12	Allotments off Kingsley Avenue	Developed
UCS 6.13	Corner of Kingsley Avenue / Arthur Street	Below site size threshold
UCS 6.14	Land fronting Arthur Street	Below site size threshold
UCS 6.15	Land off Arthur Street	Parking for adjacent industrial units
UCS 6.16	Land at Arthur Street / New Meadow Road	ELR to assess
UCS 6.17	Land off Shawbank Road	Employment site
UCS 6.18	Land off Broadground Road	Open space. ELR to assess
UCS 6.19	Land off Broadground Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 6.20	Land west of Lodge Pool	Part of Lodge Pool parkland
UCS 6.21	Land off Lodge Pool Drive	Picked up under Assets Disposal
UCS 6.22	Land off Flyford Close	Part of Lodge Pool parkland. High density housing in this area
UCS 6.23	Land off Marlfield Lane	Site within flood plain. Development would compromise width of linear park
UCS 6.24	Land adjacent to Arrow Super Squash	Access used for AVP events, parking and attractions
UCS 6.25	Land fronting Battens Drive	Partially wooded, partially sports pitches
UCS 6.26	Fronting Holloway Drive opposite / adjacent to Arrow Road	Developed

Deleted: Land 4 Leisure

Deleted: Land 4 Leisure

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 6.27	Land opposite Hopyard Lane	Wooded
UCS 6.28	Arrow Super Squash	Thriving leisure use
UCS 6.29	Land north of Lake	Would compromise linear aspect of AVP
UCS 6.30	Land off Windmill Drive (merged with 6.6)	Picked up under Assets Disposal
UCS 6.31	Land off Flyford Close	Part of Lodge Pool parkland
UCS 6.32	Land northwest of Lodge Pool	Part of Lodge Pool parkland
UCS 6.33	Land west of Lodge Pool	Part of Lodge Pool parkland
UCS 6.34	Land off Deer Barn Hill	Highway buffer
UCS 6.35	Land off Deer Barn Hill	Mainly allotments; remainder of site below site size threshold
UCS 6.36	Land by AVP southern car park	Site within flood zone
UCS 6.37	Rear of Sillins Avenue	Site to be assessed
UCS 6.38	Land south of Proctors Barn Lane	Site within flood zone
UCS 6.39	Land off Proctors Barn Lane	Site within flood zone
UCS 6.40	Land at St. Bedes RC School	Site to be assessed
UCS 6.41	Playing field – Lodge Park Middle School	School playing field
UCS 6.42	Opposite Lakeside Industrial Estate, Holloway Drive	Site within floodzone
UCS 6.43	Land between Morrisons (ex-Safeways) superstore and Brooklyn Garage	ELR to assess
UCS 6.44	Land off Holloway Drive	Below site size threshold
UCS 6.45	Dudleys, Brook Street	ELR to assess
UCS 7.1	Land off Lowlands Lane, rear of St. Peters Middle School	School playing field
UCS 7.2	Land adjacent to Foxcote Close (land within bdy of LP63)	Site to be assessed
UCS 7.3	Land between Ipsley Alders Marsh and Otter Close	Allotments
UCS 7.4	Land adjacent to the Campanile motel	Wooded and may be needed to access Winyates Green Triangle in the future
UCS 7.5	Land bound by Kingham Close and Far Moor Lane	Location / access unsuitable for housing; ELR to assess
UCS 7.6	Land at Ardens Close, Winyates Green	Heavily wooded
UCS 7.7	Land off Mordiford Close	Picked up under Land4Leisure
UCS 7.8	Play area off Colts Lane	Open space in high density housing area and significant shortfall of open space in this area

Deleted: Land 4 Leisure

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 7.9	Play area off Lowlands Lane	Open space in high density housing area and significant shortfall of open space in this area
UCS 7.10	Land rear of KNP, East Moons Moat	Employment site
UCS 7.11	Land off Tillington Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 7.12	Land off Huntington Close / Costers Lane	Open space in high density housing area and significant shortfall of open space in this area
UCS 7.13	Costers Lane (LP 54)	Open space in high density housing area and significant shortfall of open space in this area
UCS 7.14	Land off Linton Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 7.15	Land between Whitehouse Lane and Tenacres Lane	Parkland. Large open space deficit in this ward
UCS 7.16	Land off Barrow Close	Open space in high density housing area and significant shortfall of open space in this ward
UCS 7.17	Land adjacent to Winyates Way	Developed
UCS 7.18	Land south of Longhope Close	Picked up within ADR
UCS 7.19	Land adjacent to Winyates Way	Developed
UCS 7.20	Furze Lane	Developed
UCS 7.21	Land off Alders Drive	Part of SSSI
UCS 7.22	Land adjacent to Winyates Way	Within employment zone
UCS 7.23	Land between South Moon Moat and Winyates	Buffer between incompatible land uses
UCS 7.24	Land between South Moons Moat and Winyates	Buffer between incompatible land uses
UCS 7.25	Land between South Moons Moat and Winyates	Buffer between incompatible land uses
UCS 7.26	Land between East Moons Moat and Winyates	Buffer between incompatible land uses
UCS 7.27	Land off Lassington Close	Pond
UCS 7.28	Land off Lowlands Lane	Open space in high density housing area and significant shortfall of open space in this ward
UCS 7.29	Land off Berkeley Close	Wooded, semi-natural open space
UCS 7.30	Land off Berkeley Close	Wooded, semi-natural open space
UCS 7.31	Land off Furze Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 7.32	Land off Kingham Close	Heavily wooded
UCS 7.33	Land adjacent to Winyates Way	Unsuitable access
UCS 7.34	Land fronting Battens Drive	Road buffer

Formatted Table

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 7.35	Land at Edgmond Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 7.36	Side of 44 & 45 Edgmond Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 7.37	Side of 19-20 Petton Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 7.38	Side of 29 Berkeley Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.1	Land at Leys High School – playing fields	School playing fields
UCS 8.2	Land off Green Lane	Site to be assessed
UCS 8.3	Land rear of Hospital	Only consider for residential purposes if employment land review states this land would be surplus to requirements
UCS 8.4	Land at Wirehill	Partially wooded, no access
UCS 8.5	Rear of Rockford Close and Oakham Close	SSSI
UCS 8.6	Land off Rough Hill Drive	Developed
UCS 8.7	Allotments off Rough Hill Drive	Heavily wooded
UCS 8.8	Land between Salford Close and Grafton Close, Woodrow	Heavily wooded
UCS 8.9	Land north of Fladbury Close, Woodrow	Site to be assessed
UCS 8.10	Land opposite Kempsford Close, Oakenshaw South	Merged with UCS 8.46 and part of UCS 8.47
UCS 8.11	Land off Greenlands Drive, opposite Megabowl (relocation for 8.49)	Sports facility
UCS 8.12	Land off Wharrington Hill, Greenlands	Site to be assessed
UCS 8.13	Land off Wharrington Hill	Prominent play area
UCS 8.14	'South Redditch' sports fields	Sports facility
UCS 8.15	Land between Woodrow and Greenlands	Parkland – consider school site
UCS 8.16	Land at Crabbs Cross Island	Submitted site
UCS 8.17	Land fronting Rough Hill Drive	Too narrow
UCS 8.18	Land between Towbury Close / Rockford Close	Heavily wooded
UCS 8.19	Land at Rockford Close	Heavily wooded
UCS 8.20	Wirehill Wood and land rear of Lineholt Close	SSSI
UCS 8.21	Land at Wirehill	Site to be assessed
UCS 8.22	Land south of Nine Days Lane	Too narrow
UCS 8.23	Land at Leys High School – playing fields	School playing fields
UCS 8.24	Land fronting Green Lane – Local Plan windfall site	Developed
UCS 8.25	Land rear of Hospital	ELR to assess
UCS 8.26	Land rear of Hospital (merged with 8.25)	ELR to assess

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 8.27	Land fronting Woodrow Drive	Land within curtilage of land reserved for hospital expansion
UCS 8.28	Land fronting Woodrow Drive	Land within curtilage of land reserved for hospital expansion
UCS 8.29	Land fronting Woodrow Drive	Within curtilage of school
UCS 8.30	Land off Pedmore Close, Woodrow	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.31	Land at St. Thomas More RC School	Buffer strip
UCS 8.32	Land at Grafton Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.33	Land at Salford Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.34	Land fronting Greenlands Drive, opposite 'Texas'	Allotments
UCS 8.35	Land at junction of Throckmorton Road / Greenlands Drive	Heavily wooded
UCS 8.36	Play area, Lapworth Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.37	Land fronting Greenlands Drive	Merged with UCS 8.40
UCS 8.38	Dingleside Middle School and playing field	Site to be assessed
UCS 8.39	Land between Throckmorton Road and Dingleside Middle School	SPD site
UCS 8.40	Land fronting Woodrow North	Merged with UCS 8.37
UCS 8.41	Land opposite Bushley Close	Merged with UCS 8.15
UCS 8.42	Land at Fladbury Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.43	Land at Astley Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.44	Land at Woodrow Centre car park	Merged with CS04
UCS 8.45	'South Redditch' sports fields	Sports pitches
UCS 8.46	Land at 'McDonalds' Island	Merged with UCS 8.10
UCS 8.47	Land at 'McDonalds' Island	Merged with UCS 8.10
UCS 8.48	Cricket pitch, Greenlands	LP3 site 158
UCS 8.49	Off Throckmorton Road	Look at southern half of site
UCS 8.50	Mercot Close	Site not on survey plan
UCS 8.51	Front of 56 Ombersley Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.52	Side of 9 Highland Way	Below site size threshold
UCS 8.53	Adjacent 59-83 Astley Close	Developed
UCS 9.1	Land rear of Watery Lane / Ravensmere Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 9.2	Land off Ipsley Church Lane	Would compromise linear aspect of AVP
UCS 9.3	Land fronting Warwick Highway (Road Reserve)	Site to be assessed
UCS 9.4	Land fronting Warwick Highway	Access issues from Primary Distributor. Heavily planted
UCS 9.5	Land fronting Warwick Highway	Access issues from Primary Distributor
UCS 9.6	Land opposite The Griffin P.H.	ELR to assess
UCS 9.7	Land fronting Warwick Highway	Access issues from Primary Distributor

Formatted Table

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 9.8	Land east of Matchborough Way	Schools and playing fields
UCS 9.9	Land fronting Millhill Road	Site to be assessed
UCS 9.10	Land off Dilwyn Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.11	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Balancing area
UCS 9.12	Land between Matchborough and Washford	Buffer separating incompatible land uses
UCS 9.13	Land off Woolaston Road	ELR to assess
UCS 9.14	Former marble works, Crossgate Road	Developed
UCS 9.15	Former marble works, Crossgate Road	Developed
UCS 9.16	Land adjacent to Crossgate Depot	ELR to assess
UCS 9.17	Land fronting Crossgate Road	Developed
UCS 9.18	Land adjacent to Linread	Developed
UCS 9.19	Land off Pipers Road	ELR to assess
UCS 9.20	Land off Pipers Road	ELR to assess
UCS 9.21	Land off Watery Lane	Balancing area
UCS 9.22	Southern tip of Arrow Valley Park	Sports pitches located in AVP and floodplain
UCS 9.23	Land off Berrington Close, Ipsley	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.24	Land off Charlecote Close, Ipsley	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.25	Land off Alveston Close, Ipsley	Developed
UCS 9.26	Land off Ipsley Church Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.27	Land off Merevale Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.28	Land off Glebe Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.29	Land off Ipsley Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.30	Land off Ipsley Lane (The Old Rectory)	Grounds of listed building
UCS 9.31	Land off Field Farm Lane	Private garden
UCS 9.32	Land at The Elms, Upperhall Close	Developed
UCS 9.33	Land off Green Sward Lane	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.34	Land off Eathorpe Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.35	Eathorpe Close	Developed
UCS 9.36	Land off Breaches Lane	Too small. Buffer between incompatible land uses
UCS 9.37	Land between Matchborough and Washford	Buffer between incompatible land uses
UCS 9.38	Land off Millhill Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.39	Land off Winward Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.40	Land off Millhill Road	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.41	Land off Hatfield Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.42	Land off Hatfield Close	Below site size threshold
UCS 9.43	Land fronting Warwick Highway	Access issues; steep
UCS 9.44	Land bound by Warwick Highway and Matchborough Way	Access issues; steep
UCS 9.45	Land rear of Studley Road	Developed
UCS 9.46	Former Aeroquip site	Developed
UCS 9.47	Land fronting Studley Road	ELR to assess

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 9.48	Land at Aeroquip	Developed
UCS 9.49	Studley Road (BACO)	Developed
UCS 9.50	Studley Road (Delsons)	Land locked but ELR to assess
UCS 9.51	Land east of Matchborough	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.52	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.53	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	ELR to assess
UCS 9.54	Land off Heming Road	ELR to assess
UCS 9.55	Land off Heming Road	ELR to assess
UCS 9.56	Land off Bartleet Road	ELR to assess
UCS 9.57	Land fronting Icknield Street Drive	ELR to assess
UCS 9.58	Land fronting Matchborough Way	ELR to assess
UCS 9.59	Land fronting Matchborough Way	ELR to assess
UCS 9.60	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61	Land fronting Claybrook Drive (all 9.61 sites merged with 9.60)	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61(a)	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61(b)	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61(c)	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61(d)	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61(e)	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.61(f)	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.62	Land fronting Matchborough Way	ELR to assess
UCS 9.63	Land fronting Matchborough Way	ELR to assess
UCS 9.64	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Developed
UCS 9.65	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.66	Land fronting Claybrook Drive	Picked up under ADR
UCS 9.67	Land south of Ipsley Church Lane	Heavily wooded
UCS 9.68	Old Forge Drive (BACO)	ELR to assess
UCS 9.69	Oxhill Close	Developed
UCS 10.1	Land off Manor House	Access issues; private gardens
UCS 10.2	Land off Church Road	Private gardens
UCS 10.3	Land opposite Beverley Close	Play area
UCS 10.4	Land off Queen Street	Sheltered housing
UCS 10.5	Land off Chapel Street / Overdale	Mini-park redevelopment scheme in place
UCS 10.6	Chestnut Works	Developed
UCS 10.7	Land between Astwood House and Doebank House	Partially developed, remainder wooded
UCS 10.7(a)	Land between Astwood House and Doebank House	Developed
UCS 10.8	Land south of Ridgeway School	Garden land
UCS 10.9	Land off Cyprus Avenue	Below site size threshold
UCS 10.10	Land opposite Beverley Close	Densely planted
UCS 10.11	Feckenham Road / Church Road junction	Below site size threshold
UCS 10.12	Land off Feckenham Road	Allotments
UCS 10.13	Land off Queen Street	Below site size threshold

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Remarks on suitability
UCS 10.14	Land south of Sambourne Lane	Too narrow
UCS 10.15	High Street / Hoopers Lane junction	Below site size threshold
UCS 10.16	LP95	Developed
Area 11 – Feckenham – excluded from survey		
UCS 12.1	Land opposite Foredrift Close	Site to be assessed
UCS 12.2	Land opposite Wirehill Drive	Heavily wooded
UCS 12.3	Land north of Oakenshaw Wood	SWS and LNR
UCS 12.4	Land southeast of Tesco	Storm drain at western end of site. Overhead power cables may suit extension of Clews Road therefore suggest referral to employment land review
UCS 12.5	Land east of Oakenshaw Wood	SWS and LNR
UCS 12.6	Land at B&Q Island – Holloway Drive	Below site size threshold
UCS 12.7	Land adjacent to ex-Texas store	Orchids on site. High level of protection
UCS 12.8	Land at Clews Road	Developed
UCS 12.9	Land off Greenlands Drive	Balancing area

Appendix 9

Assessment matrix of surveyed sites

Appraisal Criteria		LP01	LP02	LP03	LP04	LP05	LP06	LP07	LP08
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment								
	Access to public transport								
	Access to primary school								
	Access to local retail facilities			Local Plan Commitments were not assessed at Stage B as they are either under construction or have valid planning consent and therefore are considered suitable by virtue of scrutiny within the Development Control process					
	Access to health facilities								
	Contamination on site								
	TPOs								
	Public Rights of Way								
	Open space & recreation								
	Employment Land								
	Infrastructure capacity								
	Highway access								
	Compatibility with adjoining uses								
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		G	G	G	G	G	G	R	G
What is the predominant land type?		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Appropriate timeframe for development		0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		21	10	24	89	255	18	24	22

Appraisal Criteria		LP09	LP10	LP11	LP12	LP13	LP15	LP16	PP01
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	R	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment								
	Access to public transport								
	Access to primary school								
	Access to local retail facilities		Local Plan Commitments were not assessed at Stage B as they are either under construction or have valid planning consent and therefore are considered suitable by virtue of scrutiny within the Development Control process						
	Access to health facilities								
	Contamination on site								
	TPOs								
	Public Rights of Way								
	Open space & recreation								
	Employment Land								
	Infrastructure capacity								
	Highway access								
	Compatibility with adjoining uses								
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		G	G	R	G	G	G	G	G
What is the predominant land type?		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Appropriate timeframe for development		0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		10	19	6	9	6	5	6	5

Appraisal Criteria		LPX01	LPX02	LPX03	LPX04	LPX05	LPX06	LPX07	CS01
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy		G		G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage		G		G	G	G	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding		G		G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment		G		G	G	G	G	A
	Access to public transport		G		G	G	G	G	G
	Access to primary school		G		G	G	G	G	G
	Access to local retail facilities		A		G	G	G	A	G
	Access to health facilities		G		G	A	A	A	G
	Contamination on site		G		G	G	G	G	G
	TPOs		G		R	G	G	G	R
	Public Rights of Way		G		G	G	G	G	A
	Open space & recreation		G		A	G	G	G	G
	Employment Land		G		G	G	G	G	G
	Infrastructure capacity		G		G	G	G	G	G
	Highway access		G		R	G	G	G	G
	Compatibility with adjoining uses		G		G	G	G	G	G
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?			G		G	R	G	G	R
What is the predominant land type?			G		G	G	G	G	G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development			G		G	G	G	G	G
Appropriate timeframe for development			0-5		0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology			13-22		19-36	35-58	24-40	26-44	57

Appraisal Criteria		CS02	CS03	CS04	WYG01	WYG02	WYG03	WYG04	WYG05
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy		G		G	G	G	G	
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage		G		G	G	G	A	
	Land at risk of flooding		G		R	G	G	G	
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment		G			G	G	G	
	Access to public transport		G			G	G	G	
	Access to primary school		G			G	G	G	
	Access to local retail facilities		G			G	G	G	
	Access to health facilities		G			G	G	G	
	Contamination on site		G			G	G	G	
	TPOs		R			G	R	R	
	Public Rights of Way		A			G	G	G	
	Open space & recreation		G			G	G	R	
	Employment Land		G			G	G	G	
	Infrastructure capacity		G			G	G	G	
	Highway access		G			G	G	G	
	Compatibility with adjoining uses		G			G	G	G	
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?			R			G	G	G	
What is the predominant land type?			G			G	G	G	
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development			A			G	G	G	
Appropriate timeframe for development			6-10			0-5	0-5	0-5	
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology			17			5	14-24	36-60	

Appraisal Criteria		WYG06	RB01	RB03	RB06	RB07	RB08	RB10	RB11
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G		R	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	R	G	R			R	A
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G			G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment	G		G					
	Access to public transport	G		G					
	Access to primary school	G		G					
	Access to local retail facilities	A		G					
	Access to health facilities	G		G					
	Contamination on site	G		A					
	TPOs	R		G					
	Public Rights of Way	G		R					
	Open space & recreation	G		R					
	Employment Land	G		G					
	Infrastructure capacity	G		G					
	Highway access	G		G					
	Compatibility with adjoining uses	G		G					
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		R		R					
What is the predominant land type?		G		G					
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development				G					
Appropriate timeframe for development		6-10		0-5					
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		5		45-75					

Appraisal Criteria		RB12	RB13	RB14	RB15	RB22	RB24	RB29	RB30
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	R	R	R
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	R	R	G	R	R			
	Land at risk of flooding	G	R	G	G	G			
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment								
	Access to public transport								
	Access to primary school								
	Access to local retail facilities								
	Access to health facilities								
	Contamination on site								
	TPOs								
	Public Rights of Way								
	Open space & recreation								
	Employment Land								
	Infrastructure capacity								
	Highway access								
	Compatibility with adjoining uses								
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?									
What is the predominant land type?									
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development									
Appropriate timeframe for development									
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology									

[illegible]

Appraisal Criteria		L4L03	UCS1.9	UCS1.11	UCS1.16	UCS1.20	UCS1.35	UCS1.44	UCS1.50
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	R	R	R	G	A	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding	R	G	G	G	R	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment						G		
	Access to public transport						G		
	Access to primary school						G		
	Access to local retail facilities						G		
	Access to health facilities						G		
	Contamination on site						G		
	TPOs						G		
	Public Rights of Way						G		
	Open space & recreation						G		
	Employment Land						G		
	Infrastructure capacity						G		
	Highway access						G		
	Compatibility with adjoining uses						G		
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?							R		
What is the predominant land type?							G		
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development							G		
Appropriate timeframe for development							0-5		
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology							8-18		

Appraisal Criteria		UCS1.54	UCS1.55	UCS2.14	UCS2.15	UCS2.16	UCS2.18	UCS3.3	UCS3.10
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	R	G	G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment			G		G			G
	Access to public transport			G		G			G
	Access to primary school			G		G			G
	Access to local retail facilities			A		G			G
	Access to health facilities			A		A			G
	Contamination on site			G		G			G
	TPOs			G		G			G
	Public Rights of Way			G		A			G
	Open space & recreation			G		G			G
	Employment Land			G		G			G
	Infrastructure capacity			G		G			G
	Highway access			G		G			G
	Compatibility with adjoining uses			A		G			G
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?				G		R			R
What is the predominant land type?				G		G			G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development				G		G			G
Appropriate timeframe for development				0-5		0-5			0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology				5		6-10			4-13

Appraisal Criteria		UCS3.21	UCS3.22	UCS3.23	UCS3.27	UCS3.43	UCS3.49	UCS4.1	UCS4.2
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	R	G	G	R	G	G	R	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	G	G	R	R
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment			G		G			
	Access to public transport			G		G			
	Access to primary school			G		G			
	Access to local retail facilities			A		G			
	Access to health facilities			R		A			
	Contamination on site			G		G			
	TPOs			R		G			
	Public Rights of Way			A		A			
	Open space & recreation			R		R			
	Employment Land			G		G			
	Infrastructure capacity			G		G			
	Highway access			G		G			
	Compatibility with adjoining uses			G		G			
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?				R		R			
What is the predominant land type?				G		G			
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development				G		G			
Appropriate timeframe for development				0-5		0-5			
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology				22-70		7-15			

Appraisal Criteria		UCS4.6	UCS4.36	UCS4.36 (B)	UCS5.20	UCS6.7	UCS6.10	UCS6.37	UCS6.40
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	R	G	A	A	G	R	R	A
	Land at risk of flooding	R	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment		G		G				
	Access to public transport		G		G				
	Access to primary school		G		G				
	Access to local retail facilities		G		G				
	Access to health facilities		G		G				
	Contamination on site		G		G				
	TPOs		R		G				
	Public Rights of Way		A		G				
	Open space & recreation		A		R				
	Employment Land		G		G				
	Infrastructure capacity		G		A				
	Highway access		G		A				
	Compatibility with adjoining uses		G		G				
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?			R		R				
What is the predominant land type?			G		G				
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development			G		G				
Appropriate timeframe for development			0-5		0-5				
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology			40-57		7-10				

Appraisal Criteria		UCS7.2	UCS8.2	UCS8.9	UCS8.10	UCS8.12	UCS8.15	UCS8.21	UCS8.38
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	R	G	A	G	R	R	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment				A				A
	Access to public transport				G				G
	Access to primary school				G				G
	Access to local retail facilities				A				G
	Access to health facilities				A				G
	Contamination on site				G				G
	TPOs				G				G
	Public Rights of Way				G				A
	Open space & recreation				R				A
	Employment Land				G				G
	Infrastructure capacity				G				G
	Highway access				G				G
	Compatibility with adjoining uses				G				G
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?					R				R
What is the predominant land type?					G				G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development									G
Appropriate timeframe for development					6-10				0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology					44-99				77-129

Appraisal Criteria		UCS8.47 (part)	UCS9.1	UCS9.3	UCS9.9	UCS12.1			
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G			
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	R	G	G	G	G			
	Land at risk of flooding	R	G	G	G	G			
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment		G						
	Access to public transport		G						
	Access to primary school		G						
	Access to local retail facilities		G						
	Access to health facilities		G						
	Contamination on site		G						
	TPOs		G						
	Public Rights of Way		A						
	Open space & recreation		R						
	Employment Land		G						
	Infrastructure capacity		G						
	Highway access		G						
	Compatibility with adjoining uses		G						
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?			R						
What is the predominant land type?			G						
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development			G						
Appropriate timeframe for development			0-5						
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology			16-29						