

## SA of Potential Village Site Allocations

### Method

Each reasonable option for village sites has been appraised against the full SA Framework of 16 objectives<sup>1</sup> that was developed through the SA process for the Local Plan. The SA Scoping Report published in March 2011 sets out how the SA Objectives were developed and is available on the Council's website.

Detailed appraisal matrices have been provided for each of the primary and secondary service villages to ensure that the cumulative effects (positive and negative) of proposed village site options are sufficiently considered. Any significant effects relating to individual village site options are identified within the appraisal commentary for each of the villages, thus satisfying the requirement for reporting the "significant" likely effects in accordance with the SEA Directive. The appraisal was undertaken using professional judgment, supported by the baseline information (SA Scoping Report 2011) and further updated evidence gathered as part of the Council's site selection method, as well as any other relevant information sources available. Sustainability Appraisal is informed by the best available information and data. However data gaps and uncertainties exist and it is not always possible to accurately predict effects at a strategic level of assessment.

The significance key used in the appraisal of village site options is presented below and is the same as was used in the SA for the Revised Development Strategy published in June 2013<sup>2</sup>.

**Figure 1: Significance Key.**

Categories of Significance		
Symbol	Meaning	Sustainability Effect
++	Major Positive	Proposed development encouraged as would resolve existing sustainability problem
+	Minor Positive	No sustainability constraints and proposed development acceptable
=	Neutral	Neutral effect
?	Uncertain	Uncertain or Unknown Effects
-	Minor Negative	Potential sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible
--	Major Negative	Problematical and improbable because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive

The symbols provided in the appraisal matrices relate to the cumulative effect of the proposed site options for that primary or secondary service village rather than each individual site. As previously stated, any significant effects for individual village site options are noted within the appraisal commentary.

The SA has taken a consistent approach to the appraisal of village site options, any assumption or thresholds used are presented in the table below.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix I of the Final Interim SA Report for the Revised Development Strategy (June 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Final Interim SA Report for the Revised Development Strategy (June 2013)

SA Objective	Assumptions and Thresholds	
1. To have a strong and stable economy	++	Positive effects considered unlikely as no employment land will be delivered.
	+	
	=	Assumed no employment will be provided by proposed village sites and that most people will travel to the larger settlements.
	?	Proposed sites in that village contain current employment uses which could be lost; however, the precise nature of proposals is not yet known so the effect is considered uncertain.
	-	Negative effects are not considered likely; the loss of existing employment is addressed above.
	--	
2. To enable a range of sustainable transport options	Distance from public transport as well as potential impacts on traffic are considered against this SA Objective. It is assumed that development at any of the village site options will increase traffic.	
	++	Majority of proposed sites in village have access to bus stop within 0 - 400m and/or access to train station within 1km.
	+	Majority of proposed sites in village have access to bus stop within 400 - 800m.
	=	Development is unlikely to have a positive or negative effect.
	?	No evidence relating to capacity of existing highway network.
	-	Majority of proposed sites in village have access to bus stop within 800 - 1,600m and/ or traffic flow problem or other transport issue identified by Transport Assessment (2012).
	--	Access to bus stop greater than 1,600m and/ or traffic flow problem or other transport issue identified by Transport Assessment (2012) <sup>3</sup> and/or more than 80 dwellings <sup>4</sup> proposed if all options were progressed and developed.
3. To reduce the need to travel	++	Development would significantly reduce the need to travel. This is considered unlikely as the proposed sites are in villages.
	+	Development would reduce the need to travel. This is considered unlikely as the proposed sites are in villages.
	=	A neutral effect is considered unlikely.
	?	An uncertain effect is considered unlikely.
	-	Assumed there will be a need to travel to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet the majority of peoples' needs. Minor long-term negative effect for all village sites and minor negative cumulative effects for all villages.
	--	Major negative effects considered unlikely, as sites are being identified in primary and secondary service villages.
4. To reduce the generation of waste and increase recycling	++	Positive effects considered unlikely as development will lead to an increase amount of waste produced.
	+	
	=	Neutral effect considered unlikely as development will lead to an increase amount of waste produced.
	?	An uncertain effect is not considered likely, please see below.

<sup>3</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report.

<sup>4</sup> Guidance threshold that would require the production of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan as set out in the Department For Transport's Guidance on Transport Assessment (March 2007).

	-	Assumed that all village site options will have a minor long-term negative effect negative through the generation of waste with the potential for minor long-term negative cumulative effect for all villages.
	--	Major negative effects considered unlikely given the scale of development.
5. To ensure the prudent use of land and natural resources	Land type and water protected areas are considered against this SA objective.	
	++	All potential sites are Brownfield Land.
	+	Majority of sites are either entirely or predominantly Brownfield Land.
	=	A neutral effect is not considered possible.
	?	Land type is unknown and no evidence relating to water protected areas.
	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would lead to the loss of Greenfield land.</li> <li>Site[s] within a Surface Water Safeguarded Zone and/or Groundwater Source Protection Zone.</li> </ul>
	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would lead to the loss of Green Belt Land.</li> <li>Site[s] within a Surface Water Drinking Water Protection Area 'at risk' or 'probably at risk' and/or Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area 'at risk' or 'probably at risk'.</li> </ul>
6. To protect and enhance the natural environment	The natural environment includes landscape and biodiversity.	
	++	Development has the potential for major positive effects on the landscape and/or biodiversity. Development would need to directly address an existing issue with regard to landscape and/or biodiversity.
	+	Development has the potential for positive effects on the landscape and/or biodiversity.
	=	Neutral effect on landscape and biodiversity is considered unlikely.
	?	The landscape and ecological value of the site[s] is not known.
	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development proposed in area of low to medium or medium landscape value.</li> <li>Development proposed in area of low to medium or medium ecological value.</li> <li>Development could have impacts on locally designated biodiversity adjacent to proposed village sites, includes, Local Wildlife Sites and Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats.</li> </ul>
	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development proposed in area of medium to high or high landscape value.</li> <li>Development proposed in area of medium to high or high ecological value.</li> <li>Protected species present.</li> <li>Development could have impacts on internationally or nationally designated biodiversity.</li> </ul>
7. To create and maintain safe, well-designed, high quality built environments	++	Development directly addresses an existing issue with regard to the built environment.
	+	The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. It is therefore assumed that all proposed sites can achieve this with minor positive effects on the built environment.

	=	Neutral effect considered unlikely given the requirements of the NPPF.
	?	Uncertain effect considered unlikely given the requirements of the NPPF.
	-	A proposed site goes against the Village Design Statement or Parish Plan.
	--	Development would have major negative effects on the built environment.
8. To protect and enhance the historic environment	++	Development directly addresses an existing issue with regard to the historic environment.
	+	Development has the potential for positive effects on the historic environment.
	=	Development is unlikely to have either a positive or negative effect on the historic environment.
	?	No heritage assets on or adjacent to proposed sites and archaeology unknown.
	-	Development at a proposed site could have an indirect effect on a Scheduled Monument, Listed Building and/or Conservation Area including their setting.
	--	Development at proposed sites could have a direct effect on a Scheduled Monument, Listed Building and/or Conservation Area.
9. To create good quality air, water and soils	++	Development at the site[s] would directly address an existing issue with regard to air, water and soil quality.
	+	Development at the site[s] has the potential for positive effects on air, water and soil quality.
	=	Development at the site[s] is unlikely to have a positive or negative effect on air, water and soil quality.
	?	The potential effects of development at the site[s] are uncertain.
	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is assumed that development at all the village sites have the potential for a minor long-term negative effect against this SA Objective.</li> <li>Site[s] within a Groundwater Vulnerability Zone.</li> </ul>
	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site[s] adjacent to or in close proximity to sewerage treatment plant, airport, main road (Motorway or A road) and/ or railway line.</li> <li>Site[s] located on historic landfill site.</li> <li>Development would lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</li> <li>Site[s] have been identified as potentially being contaminated<sup>5</sup>.</li> </ul>
10. To minimise the causes of climate change by reducing greenhouse gases and increasing the proportion of energy generated from renewable and low carbon sources.	++	Major positive effects are considered unlikely as development would need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide renewable or low carbon energy. It is assumed for all sites that development will increase levels of traffic.
	+	Minor positive effects are considered unlikely as it is assumed for all sites that development will increase levels of traffic and therefore greenhouse gas emissions.
	=	A neutral effect is considered unlikely as it is assumed for all sites that development will increase levels of traffic and therefore greenhouse gas emissions.
	?	An uncertain effect is considered unlikely as it is assumed

<sup>5</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

		for all sites that development will increase levels of traffic and therefore greenhouse gas emissions.
	-	A minor negative long-term effect assumed for all proposed development sites and cumulatively for villages as a result of increased traffic.
	--	Given the capacity of the sites it is considered unlikely that site[s] will have a major negative effect.
11. To adapt to the predicted impacts of climate change including flood risk	++	Development at the site[s] would directly address existing flooding risk.
	+	Development at the site[s] has the potential for positive effects on flood risk.
	=	Site[s] not in an area of medium or high flood risk.
	?	Flood risk information not available.
	-	Site[s] have identified surface water drainage issues.
	--	Site[s] located within Flood Zones 2 or 3.
12. To meet the housing needs of the whole community (ensuring the provision of decent and affordable housing for all, of the right quantity, type, size and tenure)	++	Assumed that all proposed sites have the potential for a positive effect on housing with major long-term positive cumulative effects for rural communities.
	+	Assumed that all proposed sites have the potential for a positive effect on housing.
	=	See above.
	?	See above.
	-	See above.
	--	See above.
13. To protect, enhance and improve accessibility to local services and community facilities	++	Development would lead to the provision of facilities and services.
	+	Development has the potential to support existing services and facilities.
	=	Development unlikely to have positive or negative effects on services and facilities.
	?	Assumed that all proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain.
	-	No existing services and facilities within village and none being delivered as part of development.
	--	Development would lead to the loss of existing facilities and services.
14. To improve health and well being	++	Existing healthcare facility present in village.
	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumed that all proposed sites have the potential for indirect positive effects on health through the provision of housing.</li> <li>Site[s] within 300m of natural greenspace<sup>6</sup>.</li> </ul>
	=	No existing healthcare facility in village but good/excellent access to public transport.
	?	No information on existing healthcare facilities and public transport.
	-	No existing healthcare facility in village and poor access to public transport.
	--	Development would lead to the loss of an existing healthcare facility.

<sup>6</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace standards.  
<http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf>

15. To reduce poverty and social exclusion	++	See + below.
	+	Assumed that all proposed sites have the potential for indirect positive effects through the provision of housing, therefore potential for indirect positive cumulative effects for each village.
	=	See + above.
	?	See + above.
	-	See + above.
	--	See + above.
16. To reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour	++	See ? below.
	+	See ? below.
	=	See ? below.
	?	The potential effect of development for all the proposed sites on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level.
	-	See ? above.
	--	See ? above.

The findings of the SA of potential village site options will help to inform the Council's site selection process and therefore the Council's decision on what sites will be selected or rejected. It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in its selection of options and form part of the supporting evidence, the SA findings are not the sole basis for a decision; planning and feasibility factors play a key role in the decision-making process. The reasons for the selection and/or rejection of village site options will be presented in the SA Report that will accompany the Draft Submission Local Plan on consultation in 2014.

## SA of Potential Village Site Allocations

Key:

Categories of Significance		
Symbol	Meaning	Sustainability Effect
++	Major Positive	Proposed development encouraged as would resolve existing sustainability problem
+	Minor Positive	No sustainability constraints and proposed development acceptable
=	Neutral	Neutral effect
?	Uncertain	Uncertain or Unknown Effects
-	Minor Negative	Potential sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible
--	Major Negative	Problematical and improbable because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive
+	-	Some SA objectives consider more than one topic such that there could be different effects. For example, Objective 9 includes air, land, water, light, noise, and soil quality where a potential allocation could have a negative effect on water but a positive effect on soil – thus resulting in two symbols being shown. In addition, the potential sites have been grouped under the one Village and therefore each site could have a different effect on each SA Objective and the topics within them.

Baginton																		
Site(s): BAG1*O - North of Rosewood Farm; BAG2*O - Land at Mill Hill; BAG3*O – Land to the East of Andrews Close; BAG4*O – Land off Friends Close; and BAG5*O – Russells Garden Centre																		
SA Objectives	Economy		Sustainable transport		Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
Appraisal Summary for Village	?	= +	+ --	-	-	-- -	-- +	- ?	--	-	= --	++	?	+ =	+	?		
Summary:																		
All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.																		
All the sites except for BAG3*O have current employment uses and new development on these sites is not expected to include the provision of additional employment land. At present, the level of employment at each site is unknown and although it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their economic needs and wants, the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if site BAG3*O is taken forward given that no employment land would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs.																		
Sites BAG2*O, BAG4*O, BAG3*O and BAG 1*O are not located within an area of medium or high flood risk <sup>1</sup> and the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere <sup>2</sup> . Therefore the effects on flooding are considered to be																		

<sup>1</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>2</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)



neutral for these sites. However, there has been evidence of some very minor localised flooding due to the field pattern on the BAG1\*O<sup>3</sup> and so there could be minor negative effects. Site BAG5\*O is partly within an area of medium to high flood risk<sup>4</sup> and therefore the effects on SA Objective 11 are considered to be major negative.

Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase at all allocations - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This will lead to minor negative effects. Furthermore, site BAG1\*O falls within the noise contours depicted on the Strategic Noise Map for Coventry Airport<sup>5</sup> (all other sites fall outside the contours) which means that there could be major negative effects with regard to noise and also potentially air and light pollution. All sites are within 1 km North-west of a large sewage works which means there are likely to be major negative effects with regard to noise, odour, light and air quality on any new residential development. It would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment and an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (construction & occupation) including monitoring should be carried out to address the negative effects. Moreover, sites BAG2\*O, BAG3\*O, BAG4\*O and BAG5\*O (in part) are on located on historic landfill sites which could mean that there is potential for contaminants to be present which could lead to major negative effects on SA Objective 9. For the landfill sites it would be recommended that land quality assessments are carried out to determine the risk to human health and with appropriate mitigation these sites may lead to minor positive effects on SA Objective 9 through improvement to land quality. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>6</sup>.

All sites are either located on a major or minor aquifer which is of high vulnerability<sup>7</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. Sites BAG4\*O and BAG5\*O are also located in a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (3) and development here would lead also lead to minor negative effects on water quality. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

---

<sup>3</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Services Team

<sup>4</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>5</sup> Defra (2006) Strategic Noise Map – Coventry Airport. Online at <http://archive.defra.gov.uk/environment/quality/noise/environment/mapping/aviation.htm> [accessed October 2013]

<sup>6</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, all the sites have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there is a pavement which provides safe access for pedestrians into the village centre<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, there are likely to be major positive effects on access to public transport under SA Objective 2. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic on the A46/ A45 junction (in both the short- and the long-term) which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>9</sup>. Given the size of each individual allocation, there are only likely to be minor negative effects alone on traffic under SA Objective 2. However, if all sites were taken forward this could major negative cumulative effects on traffic.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Baginton as a secondary service village which is considered to have a good range of services – Post Office, Village Food Store, Church, Village Hall, Public Houses and a mobile library service<sup>10</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no healthcare facilities within the village although the site has excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. Furthermore, sites BAG\*1, Bag2\*O and BAG\*3 have access to natural greenspace within 300 m<sup>11</sup> and therefore their development will lead to minor positive effects on Health. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land (BAG2\*O, BAG3\*O, BAG4\*O & BAG5\*O) on the edge of the village<sup>12</sup> and sites BAG4\*O and BAG5\*O are located within Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is 'at risk'<sup>13</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>9</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>10</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>11</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace standards <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompleewithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf>

Sites BAG2\*O, BAG3\*O and BAG 1\*O are located within Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is 'probably at risk'<sup>14</sup> and therefore the effects on water use are considered to be minor negative in the long-term. In addition, all sites contain Greenfield land (although sites BAG4\*O & BAG5\*O contain some Brownfield land as well) and therefore are considered to lead to minor negative effects with regard to this topic under SA Objective 5. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it is recommended that existing hedgerows are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, BAG2\*O is considered to be of high landscape value and important to the setting of Baginton Castle (Scheduled Monument). Sites BAG1\*O and BAG4\*O are considered to be of medium to high landscape value and to play a substantial role in protecting the setting of Baginton Village and providing a green buffer to Coventry<sup>15</sup>. Therefore development of the sites could lead to major negative effects on the landscape. Sites BAG3\*O and BAG5\*O are considered to be of low to medium landscape value<sup>16</sup> and as a result development of these sites is considered to have the potential for minor negative effects on landscape. In addition, there are no international or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the sites<sup>17</sup> although there is a potential Local Wildlife Site (pLWS)<sup>18</sup> which also contains the BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland adjacent the northern boundary of site BAG1\*O. The pLWS could potentially be indirectly affected by development at BAG1\*O through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term leading to minor negative effects. There is also BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland located on site BAG\*O<sup>19</sup> which could be directly affected by development and also lead to negative effects in the short and long-terms. The presence of protected species on sites BAG\*1O, BAG2\*O, BAG\*4O and BAG5\*O is considered to be more likely given that these sites are considered to be of medium ecological value<sup>20</sup> and site BAG5\*O also contains a BAP habitat. Therefore development on BAG1\*O and BAG4\*O and BAG5\*O is considered to have potential to lead to minor negative effects. The ecological value of site BAG3\*O is considered to be low<sup>21</sup> and therefore the presence of protected species is considered to be uncertain and as a result the effects on biodiversity for this site are considered to be uncertain. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure which could provide a linkage with the pLWS. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>22</sup> for Map 29 Land South of Mill Hill/ Coventry Road; Baginton should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised

---

<sup>13</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>18</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Green Infrastructure Study: Ecological Assets Map. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/6AE6AF66-D360-4728-9AB9-3CB787890738/0/EA2WarwickLeamingtonandWhitnash.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>19</sup> Defra (2013) Magic. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>20</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsizedreduced.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

in the long-term for this SA Objective.

All sites are within 400 m from one of three Scheduled Monuments around Baginton<sup>23</sup>, site BAG5\*O is also adjacent to a grade II listed bridge and site BAG1\*O abuts the Baginton Conservation Area<sup>24</sup> to the North. There is the potential for development at BAG\*1O & BAG2\*O to affect the setting of the Conservation Area, potential for development at site BAG5\*O to affected the setting of the listed bridge and although the Scheduled Monuments are unlikely to be directly affected by any development, because of their presence there could be potential for archaeology on the sites which could be directly affected. All effects on the historic environment are considered to be minor negative in the short and long-terms. Mitigation is provided to a certain extent by national planning policy and further mitigation through design and layout details could be put in place at the development management level. It is recommended that Local Plan policies are developed to protect and enhance heritage assets, including their setting, and require mitigation is available to address potential negative effects.

---

<sup>23</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>24</sup> Warwick District Council (2007) Local Plan Conservation Areas Maps - Baginton. Online at [http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/94910166-74B6-483B-B0B1-0357944BCE42/0/LP\\_CONBaginton.pdf](http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/94910166-74B6-483B-B0B1-0357944BCE42/0/LP_CONBaginton.pdf)

Barford																	
Site(s): BAR1*O - Land West of Wellesbourne Road; BAR2*O - Sherbourne Nursery; BAR3*O - Land Off Bremridge Close; BAR4*O - Land off Wasperton Road Extended; BAR5*O - Land North of Telephone Exchange; BAR6*O - South of Barford House and BAR7*O - Land rear of Granville Public House																	
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ +	- -	-	-	-	+ -	- ?	- -	-	= -	++	?	+ =	+	?	
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if all sites except for BAR1*O and BAR4*O are taken forward given that no employment land or agricultural land would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs. Development of site BAR1*O for housing would result in the loss of employment land although at present the level of employment is unknown and as a result the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage. Development at BAR4*O would lead to the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land that is currently in use, potential effect is uncertain.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that the majority of the sites are not located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>25</sup>. However, it should be noted that there is an area at risk of flooding on the very northern tip of potential allocation BAR5*O – Land North of Telephone Exchange<sup>26</sup> (minor negative effects). The NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>27</sup>.</p>																	

<sup>25</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. All allocations except for BAG4\*O and BAG6\*O are within 100 m of the A429<sup>28</sup> but there is already a large bank with young trees which will provide mitigation against possible negative effects with regard to noise, light and air quality on any new residential development. Therefore the magnitude of the negative effects is likely to be minor. Despite the presence of existing mitigation, it still would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment, an air quality assessment and an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring should be carried out to address the negative effects. In addition, site BAR1\*O, given its previous light industrial uses (garage) could have the potential for contaminants to be present<sup>29</sup> leading to major negative effects. There is also the potential for contaminants linked to the previous use to be present on site BAR2\*O. It would be recommended that for these sites a land quality survey is undertaken and this would identify and provide mitigation for any potential negative effects. In addition, development at sites BAR4\*O, BAR2\*O and BAR3\*O will lead to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land<sup>30</sup> leading to major negative effects in the long-term.

The sites are also on a minor aquifer which is of high vulnerability<sup>31</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling. In addition, Barford Village Design Statement (VDS) and the Barford Parish Plan (2006) resists further

---

<sup>27</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>28</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>29</sup> Warwick District Council (2012) LDF Evidence Base – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Online at [http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/wdc/planning/planning+policy/local+development+framework/evidence+base/strategic+housing+land+availability+assessment+\(shlaa\).htm](http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/wdc/planning/planning+policy/local+development+framework/evidence+base/strategic+housing+land+availability+assessment+(shlaa).htm)

<sup>30</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>31</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

development of land between the Village and the Bypass which means that development at all the sites is likely to lead to minor negative effects given their location. The VDS also states that large scale development would be inappropriate for the village<sup>32</sup> and therefore site BAR2\*O is likely to lead to further minor negative effects.

With regard to travel and transport, all the potential allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>33</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic on the A429/ A46/ M40 junction (in both the short- and the long-term) which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>34</sup>. Given existing traffic flows there is the potential for a major negative cumulative effect against SA Objective 2 if all sites were taken forward. Furthermore, it has been noted that concerns have been raised with regard to the access road to serve site BAR7\*O which is considered to be insufficient to serve a larger development and it has been identified that there is insufficient highways access to site BAR5\*O<sup>35</sup>.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Barford as a Secondary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as two nursery schools and a primary school<sup>36</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Barford although all allocations have excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

All sites except for BAR1\*O are on Greenfield Land and as a result development will lead to minor negative effects. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. Site BAR1\*O is on Brownfield land and therefore its redevelopment is likely to lead to minor positive effects. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as

<sup>32</sup> Barford Parish Plan Committee (2009) Barford Village Design Statement. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/58B93859-44BD-45EE-9382-E2A64390AE90/0/A4Brochurefinalfinalversionamended.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>33</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>34</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>35</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency

<sup>36</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]



well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the majority of potential sites are considered to have low, low to medium or medium landscape value<sup>37</sup>. BAR4\*O forms part of a large commercial field and is a very open landscape and BAR6\*O is considered to have a high landscape value. BAR6\*O is important to the setting of Barford House, a Grade II\* Listed Building. All the sites are located on the edge of the Village and encroach into the rural countryside and therefore there is potential for minor negative long-term effects. In addition, there are no international, local or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the sites<sup>38</sup> except for BAR5\*O which is adjacent to a potential pLWS<sup>39</sup>. The pLWS could potentially be indirectly affected by development at site BAR5\*O through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term. However, the ecological value of each site except for BAR6\*O and BAR7\*O is considered to be low<sup>40</sup> although the presence of protected species of each allocation is not known at this stage and therefore the effects are considered to be uncertain for these aspects biodiversity for these sites. The ecological value of sites BAR6\*O and BAR7\*O have been identified as low to medium<sup>41</sup> and as a result the presence of protected species is considered to be more likely and therefore the effects are considered to be minor negative for biodiversity for this site. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>42</sup> for Map 10 Land South of Westham Lane; Barford should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on any of the potential allocations<sup>43</sup>. However, all the allocations except for BAR1\*O and BAR4\*O are adjacent to the Barford Conservation Area, which also contains a number of listed buildings and as a result these sites have the potential to negatively affect character and appearance of the conservation area and possibly the settings of the listed buildings<sup>44</sup>. BAR6\*O is within the Conservation Area and important to the setting of Barford House a Grade II\* Listed Building; therefore development has the potential for significant negative effects. The overall cumulative effect for the village is considered to be minor negative. In addition, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain with regard to archaeology. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

<sup>37</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>38</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>39</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Green Infrastructure Study: Ecological Assets Map. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/6AE6AF66-D360-4728-9AB9-3CB787890738/0/EA2WarwickLeamingtonandWhitnash.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>40</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsizedreduced.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>43</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>44</sup> Warwick District Council (2007) Local Plan Conservation Areas. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Conservation/Listed+buildings+and+conservation+areas.htm> [accessed November 2013]





Bishop's Tachbrook																
Site(s): BT1*O – South of School; BT2*O – Land West of Bishop's Tachbrook and BT3*O - Land at Tachbrook Hill Farm																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ +	-	-	-	- -	-	-	-	-	=	++	?	+ =	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>BT3*O is Grade 3 agricultural land and part of a functioning farm, therefore development could have a negative effect on employment; however, at this stage the precise nature of any proposal is not known so the effect is considered uncertain. The other sites contain no existing employment and are therefore considered to have a neutral effect against SA Objective 1. It is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none of the sites are located in an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>45</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>46</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan</p>																

<sup>45</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>46</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. Furthermore, there is a national grid high pressure gas pipeline which runs through the south of site BT1\*O and an electricity line which transverse site BT2\*O. Both of these could have possible negative effects on SA Objective 9. Given the potential for negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>47</sup>. In addition, all sites will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>48</sup> leading to minor negative effects in the long-term. It is not known if the sites are classed as Grade 3a or Grade 3b.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the potential allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>49</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) on the B4087 (Oakwood Road) which leads onto Tachbrook Road which the latter has been identified by the Transport Assessment (2012) as a route which is heavily used by traffic<sup>50</sup>. It has also been noted that the roads which would service site BT1\*O are narrow and congested<sup>51</sup>. Given existing traffic flows there is the potential for a major negative cumulative effect against SA Objective 2 if all sites were taken forward.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

<sup>47</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>48</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>49</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>50</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>51</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Bishop's Tachbrook as a Primary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as a nursery school and a primary school<sup>52</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Bishop's Tachbrook although all allocations have good access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. Furthermore, site BT1\*O has access to natural greenspace (playing field) within 300 m<sup>53</sup> and therefore its development will lead to minor positive effects on Health. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a minor long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Greenfield land on the edge of the village where BT1\*O and BT3\*O are considered to be of medium importance given their role in preserving the open setting of the village to the south<sup>54</sup>. BT2\*O's Greenfield land is considered to be of medium to high importance as it play a major role in preserving the setting of Bishop's Tachbrook and Leamington Spa<sup>55</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing hedgerows/trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the sites are considered to be of high and medium to high landscape value<sup>56</sup> and therefore there is potential for major long-term negative effects. It should also be noted that there is a Tree Preservation Order present on site BT3\*O. In addition, there are no international, local or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the sites<sup>57</sup>. Site BT1\*O is identified as having low to medium ecological value, while the others are identified as having medium ecological value<sup>58</sup>. Potential for the presence of protected species and therefore minor negative effects in the short- and long-term on biodiversity. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage

---

<sup>52</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>53</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdoonlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf>

<sup>54</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>57</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>58</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>59</sup> for Map 6 Bishop's Tachbrook should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>60</sup>. A Grade II Listed Building lies approx 125m to the south west of BT3\*O, potential for minor negative effects on its setting. The potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on the historic environment are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>59</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsizedreduced.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>60</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

Burton Green																
Site(s): BG1*O - Land SW of Westwood Heath Road; BG2*O - Land off Cromwell Lane, Burton Green; BG3*O - Land off Hodgetts Lane; BG4*O - Burrow Hill Nursery; BG5*O - Land at the Rear of the Peeping Tom Pub; BG6*O - Red Lane to the south of New Farm and BG7*O - Land North of The Small Holding, Red Lane																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	?	+	--	-	-	-	+	?	--	-	=	++	?	+	=	+
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>The majority of sites have current employment uses, mainly agricultural, and new development at these sites is not expected to include the provision of additional employment land. At present, the level of employment at each site is unknown and as a result the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none of the sites are located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>61</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>62</sup>. It should be noted that the Burton Green area has been identified as having high ground water levels<sup>63</sup> and appropriate mitigation should be put in place to address this.</p>																

<sup>61</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>62</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>63</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Services Team

Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. It has been identified that there is potential for contamination to be present on site BG4\*O<sup>64</sup> and as a result there could be major negative effects on SA Objective 9. It would be recommended that for this site a land quality survey is undertaken and this would identify and provide mitigation for any potential negative effects. Furthermore, site BG3\*O is in close proximity to the proposed HS2 route and BG4\*O is within 250 m which could mean that in the future, new residential properties may be affected by noise, light and air pollution leading to major negative effect. It would be recommended that detail noise, light and air quality assessment are undertaken to address any negative effects. Moreover, there is a BPA high pressure fuel pipeline which runs through the north east corner of site BG4\*O which could lead to possible negative effects on SA Objective 9. Given the potential for negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the development is appropriate for its location<sup>65</sup>. There is also potential for the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land through development at BG1\*O, BG6\*O, BG7\*O, potential for major negative effects against SA Objective 9.

BG4\*O, BG5\*O, BG6\*O and BG7\*O are on minor aquifers of either high or intermediate vulnerability<sup>66</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

---

<sup>64</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

<sup>65</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>66</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

With regard to travel and transport, the site BG4\*O, BG6\*O and BG7\*O have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>67</sup>. Therefore, there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2 if this site is development. It should be noted that there is no obvious highways access to site BG3\*O and BG5\*O as the sites are located at the back of third party land and therefore development would not support SA Objective 2 leading to major negative effects. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) on the Red Lane which feeds into the A452 (Birmingham Road) which has been identified in the Transport Assessment (2012) as being affected by traffic<sup>68</sup>. Given the size of each individual allocation, there are only likely to be minor negative effects alone on traffic under SA Objective 2. However, if all sites were taken forward this could major negative cumulative effects on traffic.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Burton Green as a Secondary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as two nursery schools and a primary school<sup>69</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Burton Green although all allocations have good access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt land on the edge of the village<sup>70</sup> where all the sites are considered to be of medium to high or high importance as they either maintain the setting and character of Balsall Heath, Burton Green and Kenilworth<sup>71</sup> or play an important role in maintaining the wider strategic Green Belt around Coventry and the open setting of Burton Green<sup>72</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing hedgerows/trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. Furthermore,

<sup>67</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>68</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>69</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>70</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) Local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4F01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompleewithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf> [accessed October 2013]

<sup>71</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.



all sites are located in a Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is considered to be 'at risk' and therefore development of the sites could potentially lead to minor negative effects in the long-term on water use. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the landscape values of the sites vary. BG1\*O and BG2\*O are considered to be of high value and BG6\*O and BG7\*O are considered to be of medium to high value<sup>73</sup>; therefore, there is potential for both major and minor negative long-term effects on landscape. BG4\*O is considered to be of medium value although it has limited views, potential for minor negative effect. BG3\*O and BG5\*O were not surveyed but they both have an open landscape and development would lead to the loss of character. Potential for development to have positive effects on landscape at these two sites<sup>74</sup>. Taking this into account the cumulative effect on landscape for the village has been assessed as minor negative. In addition, there are no international, local or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent to the sites<sup>75</sup> and the majority of potential sites have been identified as being of low ecological value<sup>76</sup>. BG1\*O and BG2\*O have been identified as having medium ecological value, therefore there is the potential for minor negative effects on biodiversity. The presence of protected species is not known at this stage and therefore effects on biodiversity are considered to be uncertain. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on adjacent to the sites<sup>77</sup>. However, there is a Grade II listed farm house within 100 m of BG5\*O but its setting is unlikely to be affected by the development as it is largely screening from the site by two different mature hedgerows/ tall trees. In addition, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on the historic environment are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>73</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>76</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>77</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

Coventry Finham settlement																
Site(s): COP1*O – Land at Oak Lea, Howes Lane																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	=	+	-	-	-	-	+	?	-	-	?	++	?	+	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>The potential allocation is likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as the site makes provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing provided should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that the allocation will have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health and well-being.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 given that no employment land is included in the allocation and many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs.</p> <p>Part of the site may be subject to a risk of flooding according to certain EA data. There is however no evidence of this from WDC engineers – overall assessment uncertain. NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>78</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. The site is also adjacent to A46 which means there are likely to be major negative effects with regard to noise, light and air quality on any new residential development. It would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment, an air quality assessment and an EMP (construction &amp; occupation) including monitoring should be carried out to address the negative effects. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health;</p>																

<sup>78</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>79</sup>.

The site is also on a minor aquifer which is of high vulnerability<sup>80</sup> and is a Ground water Source Protection Zone (Zone 3) and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. The allocation is expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the site has excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there is a pavement which provides safe access for pedestrians into the village centre<sup>81</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on access to public transport under SA Objective 2. However, at this stage, little detail is known about existing traffic and transport issues although given the small size of the allocation at 20 dwellings there likely to be only minor negative effects resulting from the development alone on traffic under SA Objective 2.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocation within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation site. The site has the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

---

<sup>79</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>80</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))[maps.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk) [accessed November 2013]

<sup>81</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

There are healthcare facilities within Finham although the site is approximately just over 1600 m from them, however, the site has excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be minor positive in the long-term on SA Objective 14. It should be noted that the capacity of the existing health facilities are unknown at this time. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village<sup>82</sup>. In addition the site is also in a Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is 'at risk' which means there may be minor negative effects on water use<sup>83</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain. However, the site is also a Brownfield site consisting of a large domestic property and therefore its redevelopment is likely to lead to minor positive effects.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the site is considered to be of low to medium landscape value and therefore it is considered to have the potential for minor negative effects on landscape<sup>84</sup>. In addition, there are no international, national or local nature conservation designations on or adjacent the site<sup>85</sup> although there is a BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland adjacent the eastern boundary. The BAP habitat could potentially be indirectly affected by development at either one of the sites through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term. In addition, the presence of protected species is unknown but the site is considered to be of medium value<sup>86</sup> which means there are likely to be minor negative effects on these aspects of biodiversity. It is recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure with the retention of the existing trees. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the site<sup>87</sup>. However, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on the historic environment are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>82</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/ronlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompletwwithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf> [accessed October 2013]

<sup>83</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>84</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>85</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>86</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>87</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

Cubbington																
Site(s): CU1*O – Allotment land, Rugby Road; CU2*O – Land opposite Willow Sheet Meadow; CU3*O – Allotment Gardens, Coventry Road; CU4*O – Waverley Equestrian Centre; CU6*O – Confidential Site; and CU7*O – North of Bungalow Farm																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ + --	-	-	--	-- -	+	?	--	-	= --	++	?	+ =	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>All the sites except for CU1*O and CU3*O have current employment uses and new development on these sites is not expected to include the provision of any employment land. At present, the level of employment at each site is unknown. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if sites CU1*O and CU3*O are taken forward given that no employment land would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs.</p> <p>One site is located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>88</sup> and therefore there could be major negative effects on flooding. It is recommended that any residential development avoids the flood risk areas which would prevent the major negative effects identified. All other potential allocations are not located within an area of flood risk<sup>89</sup>. However, it has been identified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2013) that Cubbington</p>																

<sup>88</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>89</sup> Ibid.

suffers from major surface water flooding and that the drainage systems in the area (public, private, highway or land drainage) were not designed to cope with the exceptional conditions<sup>90</sup>. The SFRA recommended that future development is avoided and that effective planning policies should be implemented in accordance with the SUDS recommendations provided in the SFRA. Unless local plan policies are developed to address the issues of flooding with regard to new development in Cubbington, given its sensitivity there are likely to be major short to long-term negative effects.

Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. Also the potential for contamination has been identified on both site CU3\*O and CU4\*O due to previous sawmill use and as a result for these sites and site. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>91</sup>. Sites CU1\*O, CU2\*O, CU3\*O and CU4\*O will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land leading to minor negative effects in the long-term and site CU7\*O will lead to the direct loss of grade 3b agricultural land leading to major negative effects<sup>92</sup>. Sites CU1\*O, CU2\*O and CU3\*O would also result in the direct loss of existing allotment land leading to minor negative effects unless it can be re-provided elsewhere.

Sites CU2\*O, CU3\*O and CU4\*O are also on or partly on a minor aquifer which is of high vulnerability<sup>93</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are development to protect the quality of the water environment and possible require that SUDs are incorporated into schemes. This should reduce the negative effects are could lead to positive ones being realised.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment.

<sup>90</sup> Mouchel (2013) Warwick District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/99519A0F-361B-4ED7-94CC-95BA36A70AE7/0/Volume1ReportandAppendicesCombined.pdf> [accessed October 2013]

<sup>91</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>92</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>93</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the potential allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>94</sup>. Therefore, there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) on the B4453 which feeds into the A452 (Rugby Road) and the A445 (Lillington Avenue) and the latter two roads have been identified in the Transport Assessment (2012) as being heavily used by traffic<sup>95</sup>. Given existing traffic flows there is the potential for a major negative cumulative effect against SA Objective 2 if all sites were taken forward.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Cubbington as a Primary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as a nursery school and a primary school<sup>96</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Cubbington although all allocations have good access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. Furthermore, sites CU1\*O, CU2\*O and CU7\*O have access to natural greenspace within 300 m<sup>97</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor positive effects on Health. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for additional open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village for all sites, except for one site. The majority of these sites are also classed as Greenfield land. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing hedgerows/trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. Furthermore, sites CU6\*O and CU7\*O are in both a Surface Water Drinking Water Protected Area as well as a Surface Water Safeguarded Zone and therefore any development has the potential to lead to major negative

<sup>94</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>95</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDC1DFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>96</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>97</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace standards <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf>



effects on water use. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the landscape on the allocation sites CU1\*O, CU2\*O and CU7\*O is considered to be of medium to high or high value<sup>98</sup> and therefore there is potential for major negative long-term effects. The landscape of sites CU3\*O, CU4\*O and CU6\*O is considered to be of medium value and therefore there is potential for minor long-term negative effects on landscape through development. There are no international, national or local nature conservation designations on or adjacent to the potential allocation sites<sup>99</sup>. All allocations apart from CU6\*O are considered to be of low to medium and medium ecological value.<sup>100</sup> It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>101</sup> for Maps 19 North Cubbington, 20 Land at Coventry Road, Cubbington and 23 Land between Lillington/Cubbington, should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>102</sup>. However, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>98</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>99</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>100</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>101</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsizedreduced.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>102</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]



Hampton Magna																
Site(s): HM1*O – Land South of Arras Boulevard; HM2*O – Land to the East of Clifton Avenue; HM3*O – Land to the North East of Blandford Way; HM4*O – Land west of Stanks Farm; HM5*O – Land South of Lloyd Close and HM6*O – Maple Lodge																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	?	+	--	-	-	--	+	?	--	-	=	++	?	++	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>All the sites have current employment uses (agriculture) and new development on these sites is not expected to include the provision of additional employment land. At present, the level of employment at each site is unknown and as a result the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none of the sites are located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>103</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>104</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended</p>																

<sup>103</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>104</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. Potential allocation HM2\*O is also adjacent to the A46 and a sewage works which means there is the potential for major negative effects with regard to noise, odour, light and air quality on any new residential development. This is also the case for HM4\*O which is within 100m of the railway line and less than 200m from the sewage works. It would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment, an air quality assessment for site HM2\*O and HM4\*O is put in place and this would reduce the negative effects identified. In addition, it has been identified that all sites have the potential for contaminants to be present as a result of previous military use<sup>105</sup> (possible major negative effects) and as a result it would be recommended that a land quality assessment is carried out to identify and suggest mitigation for any potential negative effects. In addition, all sites will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land leading to minor negative effects in the long-term<sup>106</sup>. It is not known if the sites are classed as Grade 3a or 3b.

Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>107</sup>.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the potential allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>108</sup>. HM4\*O is less than 500m walking distance from Warwick Parkway railway station (from Old Budbrooke Road) and HM1\*O (from Arras Blvd) and HM2\*O (from Gould Road) are within 1km. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) at the A46/A4177/A425 Stanks junction which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>109</sup>. HM1\*O, HM2\*O, HM5\*O and

<sup>105</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

<sup>106</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>107</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>108</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>109</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOVeriewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

HM6\*O could individually have the potential for major negative effects alone given that they each have a capacity of over 100 dwellings. There is also the potential for major cumulative negative effects if all sites were taken forward. There could also be negative cumulative effects on A46/A4177/A425 junction if the sites at Hampton Magna are developed as well as the sites at Hatton Park, Hatton Station and Shrewley Common. It should be noted that site HM3\*O has very poor vehicle access<sup>110</sup>.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Hampton Magna as a Primary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as a nursery school, a primary school and a doctors surgery<sup>111</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

All sites are within 400 – 800 m of GP facilities within Hampton Magna and therefore there could be major positive long-term effects on SA Objective 14. It should be noted that the capacity of the existing health facilities are unknown at this time. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on SA Objective 5 through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village for all sites. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing hedgerows/trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the sites are considered to be of medium to high and high landscape value<sup>112</sup> and therefore there is potential for major negative long-term effects. There are no international, national or local nature conservation designations on or adjacent to the potential allocation sites<sup>113</sup>. However, there is a pLWS adjacent to part of site HM1\*O and site HM5\*O boundaries and the pLWS could potentially be indirectly affected by development at either one of the sites through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term. There is also a pLWS in close proximity to HM6\*O. All the allocations are considered to be of low to medium and medium ecological value<sup>114</sup> and as a result the

<sup>110</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency

<sup>111</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>112</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>113</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>114</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

presence of protected species is more likely and could mean that development at all sites could lead to minor negative effects on biodiversity in the long-term. It is recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>115</sup>. However, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>115</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

Hatton Park																
Site(s): HP1*O - Land north of Grand Union Canal; HP2*O - Land north-west of Severn Trent Treatment Works; HP3*O - Land North of Birmingham Road; HP4*O - 407 Birmingham Road and land to West and HP5*O - Land west of R75 Birmingham Road																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ +	- -	-	-	-	+	- ?	-	-	= -	++	?	+ =	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>HP1*O, HP2*O and HP4*O are used for agriculture and the new development proposed will not replace this. At present, the level of agricultural employment at the site is unknown and as a result the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none of the sites are located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>116</sup>. However, it has been noted that there is potential for substantial flooding along Birmingham road which forms the southern boundary of site HP3*O, although the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>117</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. However, all the sites are adjacent to the A4177 and therefore there is potential for major negative effects with</p>																

<sup>116</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>117</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

regard to noise, light and air quality on any new residential development and as a result it would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment, an air quality assessment and an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring should be carried out to address the negative effects. In addition, it has been identified that site HP3\*O has the potential for contaminants to be present as a result of previous hospital use<sup>118</sup> (possible major negative effects) and as a result it would be recommended that a land quality assessment is carried out to identify and suggest mitigation for any potential negative effects. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>119</sup>. Development on HP3\*O would lead to the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land<sup>120</sup>. It is not known if this is Grade 3a or 3b. The classification of agricultural land on sites HP2\*O and HP4\*O is not known.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. The allocation is expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, all the potential sites have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m<sup>121</sup> with the potential major positive effects on access to public transport under SA Objective 2. However, development at the sites is likely to increase traffic (in both the short and the long-term) at the A46/A4177/A425 Stanks junction which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>122</sup>. Given the capacity of sites HP1\*O and HP3\*O at over 90 dwellings each there could potentially be a major negative effects on traffic under SA Objective 2. Moreover, there could be negative cumulative effects on A46/A4177/A425 junction if the sites at Hampton Magna are developed as well as the sites at Hatton Park, Hatton Station and Shrewley Common.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be

<sup>118</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

<sup>119</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>120</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Post 1988 Agricultural Land Classification. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>121</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>122</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOVERVIEWFINAL.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Hatton Park as a secondary service village which is considered to have a good range of services – Village Food Store, Village Hall, a Playground; and a public house nearby<sup>123</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation site. The proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain against SA Objective 13.

There are no healthcare facilities within the Village although the sites have excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. Furthermore, sites HP1\*O, HP2\*O and HP5\*O are within 300m of a parcel of natural greenspace<sup>124</sup>. HP3\*O and HP4\*O are just over 300m away. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village.<sup>125</sup> Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees/ hedgerows are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the majority of the sites are considered to be of high landscape value<sup>126</sup> with the potential for major negative effects. HP3\*O is considered to have low landscape value although it is located on the edge of the village and therefore it is considered to lead to minor negative effects on landscape<sup>127</sup>. In addition, there are no international or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the sites.<sup>128</sup> There is a potential Local Wildlife Site (pLWS)<sup>129</sup> which also contains Smiths Covert Ancient Woodland and the BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland adjacent the northern boundary of HP3\*O. The pLWS could potentially be indirectly affected by development at either one of the sites through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term. The Grand Union Canal passes along the southern boundary of sites HP1\*O, HP4\*O and HP5\*O, which is also a pLWS. Development on HP2\*O would lead to the loss of a significant portion of Hatton Hill Fields pLWS. In addition, the presence of protected species is unknown but the sites are considered to be of medium to high value<sup>130</sup> which means there are is the

<sup>123</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>124</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace standards <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf>

<sup>125</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompletwithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>126</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>129</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Green Infrastructure Study: Ecological Assets Map. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/6AE6AF66-D360-4728-9AB9-3CB787890738/0/EA2WarwickLeamingtonandWhitnash.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>130</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

potential for major negative effects on biodiversity. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>131</sup> for Map 16 Land Adjacent Hatton Park should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there is a Grade II Listed Building (Lock House) adjacent to sites HP4\*O and HP5\*O, potential for minor short to long-term negative effects. The potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain with regard to the historic environment. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>131</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsizedreduced.pdf> [accessed November 2013]



Hockley Heath																
Site(s): HOC1*O – Former Aylesbury House Hotel and Surrounds																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	=	+ +	-	-	--	--	+	--	-	-	=	++	?	+	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>The potential allocation is likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as the site makes provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing provided should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that the allocation will have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health and well-being.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objectives 1 and 11 given that no employment land is included in the allocation, many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs and it is not located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>132</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>133</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases, however these are unlikely to be significant. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction &amp; occupation) including</p>																

<sup>132</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>133</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

monitoring which should be followed-up. In addition, given that there are existing built structures on-site, there could be potential for contaminants to be present<sup>134</sup> and as a result it would be recommended that a land quality assessment is carried out to identify and suggest mitigation for any potential negative effects. However, at this stage the significance of the effect is uncertain. The presence of contaminants could also have the potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>135</sup>. In addition, development will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>136</sup> leading to minor negative effects in the long-term. It is not known if this is classed as Grade 3a or 3b.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. The allocation is expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the site has excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there is a pavement which provides safe access for pedestrians into the village centre<sup>137</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on access to public transport under SA Objective 2. However, at this stage, little detail is known about existing traffic and transport issues although given the small size of the allocation at 20 dwellings there is only likely to be minor negative effects on traffic under SA Objective 2.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocation within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation site. The site has the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

---

<sup>134</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

<sup>135</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>136</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>137</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

There are no GP facilities within Hockley Village although the site has excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village<sup>138</sup> and in addition the site is also in a Surface Water Safeguarded Zone and a Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is 'probably at risk'<sup>139</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, there are no known landscape constraints or issues located on or adjacent to the allocation site although it is located on the edge of the Village and encroaches into the rural countryside and therefore there is potential for minor negative long-term effects. In addition, there are no international or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the site<sup>140</sup>. However, a large proportion of the southern part of the site contains the BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland and development would result in direct long-term minor negative effects on BAP habitats. It is recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure and that the BAP habitat is excluded from the development. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the site<sup>141</sup>. However, there is one grade II listed building which is 'at risk' on the buildings at risk register in the centre of the site which could be directly affected by development. This could lead to major negative effects although this could be avoided if the building is included as part of the development to be restored and re-used. Furthermore, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>138</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompleatwithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf>

<sup>139</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>141</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

Kingswood																
Site(s): KW1*O – Meadow House, Kingswood; KW2*O – Kingswood Farm; KW3*O – South of Kingswood Close; KW4*O – Station Lane, opposite Gowen Bank; KW5*O – Land South of the Stables, Station Lane; KW6*O – Land South of Rising Lane; KW7*O – Rear of Broom Hall Lane ; KW8*O – East of Lenson; KW9*O – Priory Farm; KW10*O – Swallowfield Stud; KW11*O – Land Off Brome Hall Lane; KW12*O – Land to the Rear of Kingswood Cottages; and KW13*O – Land to the west of Mill Lane																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ -	-	-	- -	- -	+	- ?	- -	-	= -	++	?	++	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>All the sites except for KW1*O, KW7*O, KW8*O, KW10*O and KW12*O have current employment uses (including agricultural land) which are likely to be lost if the sites are redeveloped for housing. At present, the level of employment at each site is unknown and although it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs, the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if sites KW1*O, KW7*O, KW8*O, KW10*O and KW12*O are taken forward given that no current employment uses would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their economic needs and wants.</p> <p>None of the sites are located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>142</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>143</sup>. However, there has been some historical evidence of flooding on Old Warwick Road and</p>																

<sup>142</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

the area around the garage and bridge near to sites KW1\*O, KW2\*O and KW12\*O<sup>144</sup>, potential for minor negative effects on flooding. Sites KW9\*O and KW10\* have also been identified as being subject to flooding on a regular basis and as a result development here will lead to minor negative effects. For the sites which have not been identified as being subject to flooding the effects are considered to be neutral on flooding.

Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. In addition, sites KW8\*O and KW1\*O are directly adjacent the main railway line so there are also likely to be major negative effects with regard to noise and light. It would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment in put in place for this site. The majority of sites are within 300m of the railway therefore mitigation may also be necessary. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>145</sup>. In addition, all sites will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land leading to minor negative effects in the long-term<sup>146</sup>. It is not known if the agricultural land is classed as Grade 3a or 3b.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, potential allocations KW1\*O, KW2\*O, KW4\*O, KW5\*O, KW7\*O, KW8\*O, KW12\*O and KW13\*O have excellent access

---

<sup>143</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>144</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Services Team

<sup>145</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>146</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>147</sup>. KW11\*O is also within 400m of a bus stop; however, there is no footpath for safe pedestrian access. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2 if these sites are developed. Site KW3\*O has good access to public transport with a bus stop within 400 – 800 m and pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>148</sup>. These sites are considered to lead to minor positive effects on SA Objective 2. However, sites KW6\*O, KW9\*O and KW10\*O have poor access to public transport with a bus stop within 800 – 1600 m and pavements to provide safe pedestrian access are not always present. Therefore development at these sites is expected to lead to minor negative effects on SA Objective 2. Furthermore all sites are within 1 km of Lapworth Station which provides a regular service to Warwick between on weekdays and weekends<sup>149</sup>. In addition, at this stage, little detail is known about existing traffic and transport issues although given the size of each individual allocation, there are only likely to be minor negative effects alone on traffic under SA Objective 2. However, if all sites were taken forward this could major negative cumulative effects on traffic. It should be noted that safe highways access cannot be achieved at sites KW3\*O, KW4\*O, KW6\*O KW8\*O.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Kingswood as a Primary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as a nursery school, a primary school, a doctors surgery and a railway station<sup>150</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are GP facilities within Kingswood which means all sites have good access to healthcare leading to major positive effects on health. The Lapworth Surgery is situated off Old Warwick Word in the South East of the Village; therefore, potential sites to the south are closer and have better access to health facilities. It is recommended that where possible, provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land although some are within the village envelope which may reduce the negative effects slightly (KW3\*O, KW4\*O, KW8\*O, KW9\*O, KW10\*O, KW12\*O and KW13\*O). These sites all contain or partly contain Greenfield land. KW8\*O, KW9\*O, KW10\*O and KW11\*O are all identified as having high value as they play a key role in maintaining the separation of settlements and open green belt views. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it

<sup>147</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.

<sup>149</sup> National Rail Enquiries (2013) Online at <http://www.nationalrail.co.uk/> [accessed October 2013]

<sup>150</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

would be recommended that existing hedgerows/trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. Furthermore, sites KW9\*O, KW10\*O and KW6\*O are in a Surface Water Safeguarded Zone and therefore any development has the potential to lead to minor negative effects on water use. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, all of the sites are considered to have either medium to high or high landscape value<sup>151</sup>; therefore, there is potential for major negative long-term effects on landscape. It should be noted that KW11\*O is separated from the main urban form so development has the potential for major negative effects on landscape. Sites KW3\*O, KW4\*O, KW5\*O, KW7\*O, and KW12\*O contain a tree or a group of trees with Tree Preservation Orders and it would be recommended that these are retained where possible to retain amenity and landscape value. In addition, there are no international or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the site<sup>152</sup>. There is a pLWS adjacent to the boundaries of sites KW1\*O, KW2\*O, KW8\*O, KW11\*O, KW12\*O and KW13\*O and as a result there could be indirect negative effects with regard to noise, light and recreational disturbance. The ecological value of all the sites apart from KW11\*O are considered to be low to medium and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on biodiversity. There is the potential for major negative effects as a result of development on KW11\*O as the site is considered to have high ecological value, given its location adjacent to the Stratford-upon-avon Canal. However, given that the majority of sites are considered to be of low to medium ecological value the overall cumulative effect for the village is assessed as minor negative. It is recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>153</sup>. However, the following sites have the potential to have a minor negative effect the setting of listed buildings in close proximity to their boundaries: KW1\*O, KW2\*O, KW3\*O, KW6\*O and KW9\*O and KW11\*O. Site KW12\*O has a listed building across the road within approximately 50m of its boundary and as a result there is potential for minor negative effects on the listed building. In addition, the potential for archaeology on all sites is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain with regard to this aspect of SA Objective 8. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>151</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>152</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>153</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]



Leek Wootton																
Site(s): LW1*O – The paddock, Police HQ; LW2*O – Land North of Main Entrance, Police HQ; LW3*O – Former Tennis Courts, Police HQ; LW4*O – Informal Car Park, Warwickshire Golf and Country Club; LW5*O – Open Field, Warwickshire Golf and Country Club; LW6*O – Land North of Hill Wootton Road; LW7*O – Land South of Hill Wootton Road; LW8*O – Woodcote House; LW9*O – Warwickshire Police HQ, Northern Lodge; LW10*O – Land off Home Farm, Leek Wootton; LW11*O – Rear of the Hamlet; LW12*O – Land off Warwick Road and LW13*O – Black Spinney Fields																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	?	= +	+ -	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	=	++	?	+	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>Sites LW1*O, LW2*O and LW3*O form part of a current employment site and site LW4*O forms part of the sports and social club which are likely to be lost if these sites are redeveloped for housing. At present, the level of employment at each site is unknown and although it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs, the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if the other sites are taken forward given that no current employment uses would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their economic needs and wants.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none are located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>154</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>155</sup>.</p>																

<sup>154</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>155</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)



Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases for all allocations. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. LW6\*O, LW7\*O and LW11\*O are adjacent to the A46; however, there is already a large bank with young trees which will provide mitigation against possible negative effects with regard to noise, light and air quality on any new residential development. Therefore the magnitude of the negative effects is likely to be minor. Despite the presence of existing mitigation, it still would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment, and an air quality assessment including monitoring should be carried out to address the negative effects. In addition, given the existence of old structures, there could be potential for contaminants on site LW8\*O which could lead to major negative effects. It would be recommended that a land quality assessment is carried out to address any potential contaminants on the site - this could lead to minor positive effects being realised. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>156</sup>.

Furthermore, sites LW1\*O, LW2\*O, LW3\*O, LW5\*O, LW8\*O, LW11\*O, LW12\*O and LW13\*O will result in the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>157</sup> leading to minor negative effects in the long-term against SA Objective 9. Development at sites LW6\*O, LW7\*O would result in the loss of grade 2 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>158</sup> leading to major negative effects in the long-term.

The sites are either on a major or minor aquifer which both have high vulnerability<sup>159</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character

<sup>156</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>157</sup> Defra (2013) Magic - Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))\maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the potential allocations LW2\*O, LW5\*O, LW6\*O, LW7\*O, LW10\*O, LW11\*O, LW12\*O and LW13\*O have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m<sup>160</sup>. Potential for major positive effects on SA Objective 2. LW1\*O, LW3\*O, LW4\*O and LW9\*O have good access to public transport with a bus stop within 400 - 800 m<sup>161</sup>, potential for minor positive effects. Site LW8\*O is within 1km of a bus stop; therefore, potential for a minor negative effect on SA Objective 2. Development at the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) on the A429 (Coventry Road) which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>162</sup>. Given the small size of each allocation, individually they are unlikely to have major negative effects on traffic. However, given existing traffic flows there is the potential for a major negative cumulative effect against SA Objective 2 if all sites were taken forward. As a result, the potential cumulative effects on traffic are considered to be major negative.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Leek Wotton as a Secondary Service Village which has a number of community facilities as well as a primary school<sup>163</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Leek Wotton although all allocations have excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. Furthermore, sites LW1\*O, LW2\*O, LW3\*O, LW9\*O, LW10\*O, LW11\*O, LW12\*O and LW13\*O have access to natural greenspace within 300 m<sup>164</sup> and therefore their development will lead to minor positive effects on Health. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

<sup>160</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>163</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>164</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace standards <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land<sup>165</sup>. Sites LW1\*O, LW2\*O, LW3\*O, LW4\*O, LW5\*O, LW6\*O and LW7\*O are considered to be of high importance to the Green Belt<sup>166</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees/ hedgerows are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. In addition, sites LW4\*O, LW5\*O and LW8\*O are located wholly within and sites LW3\*O, LW7\*O, LW9\*O, LW11\*O and LW12\*O partly within a Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is 'at risk'<sup>167</sup>. Therefore development at any of the sites could lead to major negative effects. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, LW5\*O and LW7\*O are considered to have high landscape value as they are large open areas with high visibility so there is the potential for a major negative effect. LW1\*O to LW4\*O, LW6\*O and LW8\*O are considered to have medium landscape value<sup>168</sup>; therefore, the potential for minor negative effects on landscape. The landscape value for the other sites is not known so it is assumed that there is also the potential for minor negative effects.

Sites LW1\*O, LW2\*O, LW3\*O, LW8\*O, LW9\*O and LW10\*O contain one or more of the following BAP priority habitats: Woodpasture and Parkland; and Deciduous Woodland<sup>169</sup>. Development on these sites would result in direct long-term minor negative effects on BAP habitats. LW6\*O is adjacent to a pLWS, which could potentially be indirectly affected by development through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term. The presence of protected species and the ecological value of the other sites are not known at this stage so it is assumed that there would be minor negative effects on biodiversity. It is recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>170</sup> for Map 36 Land R/O The Hamlet, Leek Wootton; should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there is a listed building within site LW8\*O (Woodcote House Grade II Listed)<sup>171</sup> and therefore the potential for major short to long-term negative effects. Development on site LW1\*O could also have impacts on the setting of Woodcote House, potential for minor negative effects. There is a listed building in close proximity to the north west boundary of site LW5\*O and therefore potential for impacts on its setting; however,

<sup>165</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) Local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompletemithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>166</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>167</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))\maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>168</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>169</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Habitats. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>170</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsized.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>171</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

there are a number of trees that provide screening and should help to mitigate any negative effects. Sites LW1\*O and LW8\*O have the potential to negative effect the setting of the grade II listed building of Woodcote House. The sites also have the potential to have negative effects on the setting of the Leek Wootton Conservation Area, in particular sites LW2\*O, LW5\*O, LW10\*O and LW13\*O as they are adjacent to the Conservation Area. In addition, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on historic environment are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

Radford Semele																				
Site(s): RS1*O – Land South of Southam Road; RS2*O – Land North of Southam Road; Expanded RS2*O; RS3*O – South West Radford Semele; RS4*O - Land to the East of Church Lane																				
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport		Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources		Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime		
	1	2		3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Appraisal Summary for Village	?	+	--	-	-	-	--	-	+	-	?	-	-	=	++	?	+	=	+	?
Summary:																				
All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.																				
All the sites are currently used for agriculture and this use is not expected to be re-provided elsewhere. However, the level of agricultural employment at each site is unknown at this stage and therefore the effects on the economy are considered to be uncertain.																				
There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none of the sites are located within an area of medium or high flood risk <sup>172</sup> . Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere <sup>173</sup> .																				
Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. Part of																				

<sup>172</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>173</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf) [accessed November 2013]

sites RS1\*O and RS2\*O are being considered for gas pipeline installation and therefore this could have the potential to lead to minor negative effects on SA Objective 9. Given the potential for negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>174</sup>. In addition, all sites will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>175</sup> leading to minor negative effects in the long-term. It is not known if the agricultural land is Grade 3a or 3b.

Every site apart from RS4\*O is on a minor aquifer which is of high vulnerability<sup>176</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, all the potential allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there are pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport<sup>177</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2. It should be noted that for sites RS1\*O, RS1\*O Expanded and RS2\*O there is not a pavement immediately adjacent the site although it is anticipated that mitigation would be easy to implement. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) on Radford Road which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) is a route which experiences high traffic flows<sup>178</sup>. Given existing traffic flows there is the potential for a major negative cumulative effect against SA Objective 2 if all sites were taken forward There is the potential for a major

<sup>174</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf) [accessed November 2013]

<sup>175</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>176</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>177</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>178</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOVeriewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

negative effect alone if RS1\*O and RS4\*O were developed as they both have capacity for 100 dwellings or more. It should be noted that safe highways access cannot be achieved at sites RS1\*O and RS2\*O<sup>179</sup>.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Radford Semele as a Primary Service Village which has a number of shops and community facilities as well as a nursery school and a primary school<sup>180</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Radford Semele although all allocations have excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. Furthermore, all sites have access to natural greenspace within 300 m<sup>181</sup> and therefore its development will lead to minor positive effects on Health. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a minor long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Greenfield Land on the edge of the village where the majority of sites are considered to be of medium to high importance given they play a major role in preserving the setting of the village or in maintaining the open corridor setting to Radford Semele and Leamington Spa<sup>182</sup>. Site RS3\*O is considered to have high importance as it is a strategically important Green Field parcel, that plays a role in maintaining the separation of Radford Semele from Sydenham. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees are maintained and that additional screening/landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. In addition, all sites are located in a Surface Water Safeguarded Zone and sites RS1\*O, RS1\*O Expanded, RS2\*O, and RS4\*O are particularly sensitive as they are located in a Surface Water Drinking Water Protected Area which is at risk<sup>183</sup>. Potential for major negative effects. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, . The ecological value of all the sites apart from RS1\*O and RS1\*O Expanded is considered to be low; therefore, there is

---

<sup>179</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency

<sup>180</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>181</sup> Warwick District Council (2010) Accessible Natural Greenspace standards <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/2168A53B-62DA-47EF-9A5D-2589AF448308/0/AN1LOCALSITES.pdf>

<sup>182</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>183</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

the potential for minor negative effects on biodiversity. At site RS1\*O and RS1\*O Expanded the presence of protected species is unknown and the ecological value is considered to be low<sup>184</sup> and therefore the effects on biodiversity are considered to be uncertain. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. Furthermore, it would be suggested that the recommendations put forward in the Warwick District Habitat Assessment (2008)<sup>185</sup> for Maps 37 Land at Southam Lane, Radford Semele and 2 Land West of Radford Semele should be implemented as appropriate subject to recent survey data. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>186</sup>. However, there are a number of listed buildings within 200m of sites RS1\*O, RS1\*O Expanded, RS2\*O and RS4\*O. In particular, development at RS4\*O has the potential for negative effects on the setting of Paris Church of St Nicholas a Grade II Listed Building. In addition, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on the historic environment are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibid.

<sup>185</sup> Habitat Biodiversity Audit Partnership for Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull (2008) Warwick District Habitat Assessment. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/3AD13473-716B-41DA-BCF2-5C607D78CDEC/0/WarwickDistrictHabitatAssessmentstandardsizedreduced.pdf> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>186</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]



Hatton Station																
Site(s): HS1*O – Former Storage Depot, Oakdene Crescent; HS2*O – Land West of Station Road; and HS3*O – Land off Station Road																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ +	-	-	- -	- -	+	?	- -	-	=	++	?	+ =	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>Site HS3*O is currently used for agriculture and this is not expected to be replaced. At present, the level of employment at the site is unknown and as a result the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if sites HS1*O and HS2*O are taken forward given that no current employment uses would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their economic needs and wants.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that none of the sites are located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>187</sup>. There is however, an area at risk of flooding directly adjacent to potential allocations HS2*O – Land West of Station Road and HS3*O – Land off Station Road. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>188</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. Potential allocations, HS2*O – Land West of Station Road and HS3*O – Land off Station Road, are also adjacent to M40 which</p>																

<sup>187</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>188</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf) [accessed November 2013]

means there are likely to be major negative effects with regard to noise, light and air quality on any new residential development and potential allocation, HS1\*O – Former Storage Depot, Oakdene Crescent, is next to the mainline railway and so there are also likely to be major negative effects with regard to noise and light. It would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment, an air quality assessment (for sites HS2\*O and HS3\*O) and an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring should be carried out to address the negative effects. In addition, given the previous uses of site HS1\*O, there could be potential for contaminants to be present at this site<sup>189</sup> (possible major negative effects) and as a result it would be recommended that a land quality assessment is carried out to identify and suggest mitigation for any potential negative effects. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>190</sup>. In addition, all sites will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>191</sup> leading to minor negative effects in the long-term. It is not known if the agricultural land is Grade 3a or 3b.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, all the potential allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and all are within 400 m of Hatton railway station (site HS1\*O being the closest and site HS3\*O being the farthest)<sup>192</sup>. Hatton stations provide a regular service on weekdays and weekends into Warwick<sup>193</sup>; however the bus service provided at Hatton Station is only a request stop. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on access to public transport under SA Objective 2. However, there are no pavements which provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre or to public transport and therefore there are likely to be minor negative effects on this topic covered by SA Objective 2. The sites

---

<sup>189</sup> Warwick District Council Environmental Health Team

<sup>190</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf) [accessed November 2013]

<sup>191</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>192</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>193</sup> National Rail Enquiries (2013) Online at <http://www.nationalrail.co.uk/> [accessed October 2013]

are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) at the A46/A4177/A425 Stanks junction which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>194</sup>. Given the small size of each individual allocation there likely to be only minor negative effects resulting from each development alone on traffic under SA Objective 2. However, there could be major negative cumulative effects on A46/A4177/A425 junction if the sites at Hampton Magna are developed as well as the sites at Hatton Park, Hatton Station and Shrewley Common. It should also be noted that safe highways access cannot be achieved for site HS2\*O<sup>195</sup>.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Hatton Station as a very small Village and Hamlet which does not have any community facilities but does have a nursery school and a mainline station proving good access to Warwick<sup>196</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There are no GP facilities within Hatton Station although all allocations have excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village<sup>197</sup> which is considered to be of high environmental value on HS1\*O and medium value of HS2\*O<sup>198</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain. In addition, sites HS2\*O and HS3\*O are on Greenfield land and as a result development will lead to minor negative effects whereas site HS1\*O is on Brownfield land and therefore its redevelopment is likely to lead to minor positive effects.

<sup>194</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>195</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency

<sup>196</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>197</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompletwithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf>

<sup>198</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

With regard to SA Objective 6, the landscape value for sites HS1\*O, HS2\*O and HS3\*O are considered to be medium and low<sup>199</sup> and as a result there is potential for minor negative long-term effects on landscape. In addition, there are no international, local or national nature conservation designations on or adjacent the site<sup>200</sup>. However, approximately 50% of both sites HS1\*O and HS2\*O contain the BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland and development would result in direct long-term minor negative effects on BAP habitats<sup>201</sup>. The presence of protected species has been confirmed on site HS1\*O<sup>202</sup>. The effects on biodiversity as a result of development on site HS3\*O are considered to be uncertain at this stage although the ecological value is considered to be low<sup>203</sup>. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure and that the BAP habitat is excluded from the development. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>204</sup>. However, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on historic environment are considered to be uncertain. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

---

<sup>199</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>200</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>201</sup> Ibid.

<sup>202</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>203</sup> Ibid.

<sup>204</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

Shrewley Common																
Site(s): SC01*O – Land at the Gatehouse; and SC02*O Land South East of Shrewley Common																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	= ?	+ -	-	-	--	-	+	?	--	-	=	++	?	+ =	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>All potential allocations are likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as all sites make provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing developments should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that all the allocations have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health.</p> <p>Site SC01*O is currently used for agriculture and this is not expected to be replaced. At present, the level of employment at the site is unknown and as a result the effects on employment are considered to be uncertain at this stage. There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 1 if site SC02*O is taken forward given that no employment land would be lost and it is assumed that many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their employment needs.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objective 11 given that neither site is located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>205</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>206</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan</p>																

<sup>205</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>206</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction & occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. Both sites are directly adjacent the main railway line so there are also likely to be major negative effects with regard to noise and light. It would be recommended that suitable mitigation including appropriate noise attenuation resulting from a noise assessment is put in place for the sites. Given the potential for major negative effects on SA Objective 9, there may also be potential for negative effects on human health; however, it is considered that suitable mitigation to prevent unacceptable risks from pollution will be provided by Local Plan policies and at the project level to ensure that effects are not significant and that the new development is appropriate for its location<sup>207</sup>. In addition, all sites will lead to the direct loss of grade 3 (provisional) agricultural land<sup>208</sup> leading to minor negative effects in the long-term. It is not known if the agricultural land is Grade 3a or 3b.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. All allocations are expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, both allocations have excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there is a pavement which provides safe access for pedestrians into the village centre<sup>209</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on SA Objective 2. However, the sites are likely to increase traffic (in both the short- and the long-term) at the A46/A4177/A425 Stanks junction which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>210</sup>. Given the small size of both allocations there are likely to be only minor negative effects on traffic in the Village and the junction mentioned under SA Objective 2. Moreover, there could be negative cumulative effects on A46/A4177/A425 junction if the sites at Hampton Magna are developed as well as the sites at Hatton Park, Hatton Station and Shrewley Common.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocations within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

<sup>207</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 120. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>208</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>209</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>210</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOVERVIEWFINAL.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Shrewley Common as a small and feeder village which contains important local facilities – a shop, pub and village hall<sup>211</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation sites. All proposed sites have the potential to both support and increase pressure on existing services and facilities. The capacity of existing services and facilities is unknown, therefore the effect is considered uncertain on SA Objective 13.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village<sup>212</sup>. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing hedgerows are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend development at both potential allocations into the landscape. Site SC01\*O – Land at the Gatehouse will also result in the loss of Greenfield land leading to further negative effects where as SC02\*O Land South East of Shrewley Common will allow for the redevelopment of Brownfield land which will result in minor positive effects. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, the landscape value of both the sites is considered to be low to medium<sup>213</sup> and therefore there is potential for minor negative long-term effects. In addition, there are no international or local nature conservation designations on or adjacent to either of the allocations although the Shrewley Canal Cutting SSSI is with 100 – 150 m of the sites<sup>214</sup>. There is also a pLWS adjacent to the southern boundaries of the sites. The SSSI and pLWS could potentially be indirectly affected by development at either one of the sites through noise, air and light pollution during the short-term (during construction) and in the long-term. Given the capacity of the sites it is considered that negative effects on the SSSI are unlikely. In addition, the ecological value of the sites has been assessed as being low to medium and as a result the presence of protected species is considered to be more likely leading to minor negative effects on biodiversity. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure and site specific landscaping. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

There are no healthcare facilities within the village although the sites have excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated listed buildings, Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the sites<sup>215</sup>. However, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects on the historic environment are considered to be uncertain.

<sup>211</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>212</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompletemwithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf>

<sup>213</sup> Warwick County Council Landscape and Ecology Team

<sup>214</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>215</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]

It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.



Hill Wootton																
Site(s): HW1*O – Land South of Hill Wootton Road																
SA Objectives	Economy	Sustainable transport	Reduce need to travel	Waste & Recycling	Prudent use of land and natural resources	Natural environment & landscape	Built environment	Historic environment	Air, water & soil quality	Climate change mitigation	Climate change adaptation - flood risk	Housing needs	Local services & community facilities	Health & well being	Poverty & social exclusion	Crime
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Appraisal Summary for Village	=	+ +	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	=	++	-	+	+	?
<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>The potential allocation is likely to lead to major positive long-term effects on housing needs as the site makes provision for housing. The NPPF requires that housing provided should meet the needs of different groups in the community, be of high quality and should also provide affordable housing. Therefore, it is considered that the allocation will have the potential for minor positive effects in the long-term on poverty and social exclusion as well as indirect positive effects on health and well-being.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be any significant effects on SA Objectives 1 and 11 given that no employment land is included in the allocation, many villagers will travel outside of their village to obtain the majority of their needs and wants and that it is not located within an area of medium or high flood risk<sup>216</sup>. Furthermore, the NPPF requires that planning authorities should ensure that new development should not increase flood risk elsewhere<sup>217</sup>.</p> <p>Air, light and noise pollution along with waste and emissions contributing to climate change are likely to increase - particularly in the short term during the construction phases. This is likely to affect the wider environment and particularly, during the short-term, residential development in close proximity leading to minor negative effects. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address negative effects. Effectiveness depends on detailed design and implementation - it is recommended that there should be a requirement for an EMP (construction &amp; occupation) including monitoring which should be followed-up. Development would lead to the loss of grade 2 agricultural land<sup>218</sup>, potential for major negative effects.</p>																

<sup>216</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>217</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 103. Online at [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf)

<sup>218</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

The sites are also on a minor aquifer which is of high vulnerability<sup>219</sup> and therefore development could lead to minor negative effects on water quality which is considered under SA Objective 9. It is recommended that strong policies are developed to protect the water environment and the incorporation of SUDs into schemes should also be sought, where it is feasible. This should reduce the potential negative effects and could also potentially lead to positive benefits.

The effect on crime is uncertain at this stage. The effects on crime will depend on the design and layout finalised at the development management level although consideration should be given to inserting a design policy to encourage sustainable design and to take account of the Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention Guidance (September 2004) and any other relevant guidance. This would increase the potential for positive effects.

The NPPF requires that all development should achieve high quality and inclusive design, establish a strong sense of place, respond to local character and create safe and accessible environment. The allocation is expected to achieve this leading to minor positive effects on the built environment. Potential for an enhanced positive effect if there was a policy that required all residential development to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 5. This recommendation could also lead to positive effects being realised for climate change mitigation and adaptation, crime, prudent use of land and natural resources and waste and recycling.

With regard to travel and transport, the site has excellent access to public transport with a bus stop within 0 - 400 m and there is potential for a pavement to be incorporated to provide safe access for pedestrians into the village centre and to the bus stop<sup>220</sup>. Therefore there are likely to be major positive effects on access to public transport under SA Objective 2. However, the site is likely to increase traffic on the A429 (Coventry Road) which according to the Transport Assessment (2012) experiences high traffic flows<sup>221</sup> although given its small size there are likely to be only minor negative effects (both in the short and long-term) on traffic under SA Objective 2.

It is acknowledged that given the location of the potential allocation within a village, there will be a need to travel either to other villages or towns to obtain access to employment as well as services and facilities to meet peoples' needs. Therefore, the effects on SA Objective 3 are considered to be minor negative.

The Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report classifies Hill Wootton as a very small village and hamlet and does not have any community facilities or shops<sup>222</sup>. No further local service or community facility development is planned at the potential allocation site. Given lack of services, any development it here is likely to lead to minor negative effects in the long-term on SA Objective 13 unless provision of community facilities is made.

<sup>219</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>220</sup> Google (2013) Google maps. Online at <https://maps.google.co.uk/> [accessed November 2013]

<sup>221</sup> Warwickshire County Council and Highways Agency (March 2012) Warwick District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy Strategic Transport Assessment Overview Report. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/0E13ED7C-6364-4D29-A85C-FD72EC235B3D/0/WDCLDFSTAOOverviewFinal.pdf> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>222</sup> Warwick District Council (June 2013) Draft Village Settlement Hierarchy Report June 2013. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/WDC/Planning/Planning+policy/Local+Development+Framework/Evidence+Base/> [accessed November 2013]

There are no healthcare facilities within the Village although the site has excellent access to public transport and therefore the effects are considered to be neutral on SA Objective 14. In addition with regard to Health, it would be recommended that where possible provision should be made for open space and/or Green Infrastructure at each of the sites. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Health.

There is the potential for a major long-term negative effect on the prudent use of land through the loss of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village<sup>223</sup>. In addition the site would also result in the loss of Greenfield land and is located in a Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area which is 'probably at risk'<sup>224</sup> which is likely to have minor negative effects with regard to these aspects of SA Objective 5. Mitigation to a certain extent is provided by national planning policy and it would be recommended that existing trees/ hedgerows are maintained and that additional screening/ landscaping is inserted where appropriate to help blend the development into the landscape. It is anticipated that there will be plan policies to require resource-efficient design and construction methods as well as a policy to encourage the use of sustainable resources but until these policies are in place then the effects relating to these topics are considered to be uncertain.

With regard to SA Objective 6, there are no known landscape constraints or issues located on or adjacent to the allocation although it is located on the edge of the Village and will encroach into the rural countryside and therefore there is potential for minor negative long-term effects. In addition, there are no international, national or local nature conservation designations on or adjacent the site<sup>225</sup>. The presence of protected species and the ecological value of the site are unknown and therefore the effects on biodiversity are considered to be uncertain. It would be recommended that strong environmental policies are developed to protect and encourage enhancement of the natural environment and include provision for green infrastructure. This would mitigate any negative effects and possibly lead to positive effects being realised in the long-term for this SA Objective.

With regard to SA Objective 8, there are no designated Conservation Areas or Scheduled Monuments on or adjacent to the site<sup>226</sup>. However, there is one grade II listed farm house adjacent and therefore there could be potential for minor negative effects on its setting. Furthermore, the potential for archaeology is unknown at this stage and as a result the effects are considered to be uncertain with regard to the archaeology. It is considered that suitable mitigation will be set out through development management policies in the Local Plan and will also be available at the project level to address any potential negative effects.

<sup>223</sup> Warwick District Council (May 2012) local Plan – Helping Shape the District, Preferred Options. Online at <http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/4E01EA4B-85C2-48D5-A649-6FAB2EF4533F/0/LocalPlanPreferredOptionsCompletwithAppendicesandCoversRFS.pdf>

<sup>224</sup> Environment Agency (2013) What's in Your Backyard? Interactive Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed November 2013]

<sup>225</sup> Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed November 2013].

<sup>226</sup> English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed November 2013]