

**GREEN BELT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PARCELS AND SUB-PARCELS OF LAND (MM)**  
[BARFORD – Site 6 Land South of Barford House](#)

Fundamental Aim of Green Belt	Essential Characteristics of Green Belt	Boundary Review Criteria	Boundary Review Analysis	<u><a href="#">Boundary Review</a></u>	Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities
<p><b>To prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</b></p>	<p>Openness is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There is an absence of existing built development, or current planning permissions for inappropriate development.</p> <p>The landscape is predominantly open and rural in character.</p> <p>The openness, character and condition of the Green Belt remain largely intact, with particular reference to the Warwickshire Landscapes Guidelines. Built development would have the potential to significantly affect the open character and visual amenities, whether or not it is visible from public footpaths, bridleways or viewpoints.</p>	<p>(Q1) Is it necessary to keep the parcel of land permanently open to protect the essential characteristic of Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q2) Would development in this parcel be harmful to the open character of the Green Belt, so as to give the appearance of urban sprawl?</p> <p>(Q3) If the character of the area needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, including normal development management policies and the parcel removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Q1:</a></u>  <a href="#">This small parcel of land forms an integral part of the village of Barford and contributes to its semi-rural character with some mature vegetation. The land is partially bounded by residential curtilage, garden land, allotments and Wasperton Lane. The land does have landscape and nature conservation value and contributes to the character of the village, although these are not essential characteristics of the Green Belt.</a></p> <p><u><a href="#">Q2:</a></u>  <a href="#">The land is partially bounded by residential curtilage, allotments and public highway. Although there is considerable vegetation on the site, which may have some important nature conservation and landscape value, as a relatively small site, its release from the Green Belt would only have a modest impact on the open character of the Green Belt.</a></p> <p><u><a href="#">Q3</a></u>  <a href="#">The identified natural characteristics of the site, including any important trees and habitats, may need to be protected for other reasons, such as nature conservation, by the use of normal development management policies, including Tree Preservation Orders. Similarly, identified important natural features should be protected and integrated into any proposals for development, while having due regard to the relevant Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines. New boundary treatment</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>

				<p><a href="#">and compensatory planting should also soften hard built edges to the adjoining Green Belt and minimise the appearance of suburbanisation.</a></p>	
	<p>Permanence is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There are exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Green Belt is associated with readily recognisable physical features which are likely to be permanent e.g. roads, railways, watercourses (canals, rivers and streams), mature natural field boundaries, woodland edges, and topographical features such as ridgelines.</p> <p>The boundary is robust and capable of enduring well beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open has not been included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The boundary meets national policy aims and purposes, while urban and village extensions provide most appropriately for sustainable patterns of development and growth.</p>	<p>(Q4) Is this parcel of Green Belt associated with recognisable and permanent physical features?</p> <p>(Q5) Is it possible that the Green Belt boundary may need to be altered at the end of the development plan period?</p> <p>(Q6) Are there any existing or potential threats that may weaken the ability of the Green Belt to endure beyond the plan period, including the potential cumulative impact of major proposals and associated infrastructure?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q4</a> <a href="#">The land adjoins residential curtilages, which currently provide a recognisable and permanent physical boundary to the Green Belt.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q5</a> <a href="#">As an integral part of the village, the land is partially bounded by built development. However, additional compensatory landscaping would be required in order to establish a new, long-term defensible boundary. The local planning authority should also satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundary would not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period in accordance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. In practice, this means that, once Green Belt boundaries have been defined, they should only be reviewed if the development needs of an area, looking ahead over the long term, clearly cannot be met from within the urban area(s), principally through the recycling of previously developed land.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q6</a> <a href="#">The local planning authority should also satisfy themselves that there are no existing or potential threats that would weaken the ability of any revised Green Belt boundary to endure in this location.</a></p>	
<b>Green Belt Purpose</b>	<b>Consideration of Green Belt Purpose</b>	<b>Boundary Review Criteria</b>	<b>Boundary Review Analysis</b>		<b>Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities</b>
<b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</b>	<p>Protects urban fringe and open countryside from unplanned built development connected to large built up areas, thus</p>	<p>The 'green lung' around the towns and villages will be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>A detailed Green Belt boundary</p>	<p>(Q7) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development?</p> <p>(Q8) Would the loss of this Green Belt</p>	<p><a href="#">Q7</a> <a href="#">The release of this land would not promote ribbon development.</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation</li> </ul>

	maintaining a clear distinction between urban and rural.	will not be altered merely because the land has become derelict. Consideration will be given to alternative positive Green Belt uses.	<p>parcel result in an isolated development site not connected to existing boundaries?</p> <p>(Q9) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern?</p> <p>(Q10) Is this Green Belt parcel connected by several boundaries to the built-up area?</p> <p>Large built-up areas are defines as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Rural South and East (integrating Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath, Balsall Common, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Meriden, Hampton-in-Arden, Hockley Heath, Tidbury Green, Catherine-de-Barnes) , Coventry Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon. Solihull Settlement Study defines Rural South and East settlements as stand alone. However, there appears to be a degree of continuation between settlements (Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath).</p>	<p><a href="#">Q8</a> <a href="#">The release of this land would constitute an infill parcel within the built-up area of the village.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q9</a> <a href="#">The loss of this parcel could not reasonably be defined as 'rounding off'. A more accurate description would be an 'infill' within the existing settlement pattern of the village.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q10</a> <a href="#">The parcel is connected by an existing residential curtilage to the west and a public highway to the south. The land to the north and allotments to the east form part of the Green Belt.</a></p>	<p>(including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>
	Prevents sprawl where development would not otherwise be restricted by a permanent physical barrier (e.g. roads, railways, watercourses, woodland edge or topographical feature).	Development would be contained by strong physical and visual features, and would not lead to subsequent encroachment.	(Q11) Do recognisable and permanent physical features provide a good barrier between the existing urban area and undeveloped land, which if breached may set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl?	<a href="#">Q11</a> <a href="#">There is currently a defensible Green Belt boundary forming part of the residential curtilage to the west of the land. As a potential infill development, it is unlikely to set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl, so long as a clear, defensible boundary is established, reinforced by substantial landscaping to protect the visual amenities of the Green Belt in all seasons.</a>	
	Prevents development that would result in another settlement being absorbed into a large built up area.	Development is capable of being contained by an existing settlement and strong physical boundaries, and would not lead to 'unrestricted sprawl' into adjoining parcels.	(Q12) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in a small settlement being absorbed into a large built-up area?	<a href="#">Q12</a> <a href="#">No – The land forms part of the existing village.</a>	

	Protects open land contiguous to, or within close proximity to, a large built up area.	The release of Green Belt land would not damage the open character of the Green Belt.	(Q13) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the open land contiguous to, or with close proximity to, the large built up area?	<a href="#">Q13</a> <a href="#">While there would be some potential loss of green space, the land does not form part of the open countryside and any visual impact could be minimised by a sensitively designed development, combined with substantial compensatory landscaping.</a>
<b>Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	Prevents the merger of towns within the Green Belt.	The release of Green Belt land will not damage the substantial open character of the Green Belt separating towns and villages.  Any gaps that have to be kept open in order to ensure that adjacent settlements do not merge, are identified as essential gaps, regardless of their size or quality.	(Q14) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel increase the potential merging of towns?  (Towns are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Major Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon.)	<a href="#">Q14</a> <a href="#">No – The land forms part of the existing village.</a>
	Prevents development that would result in a reduction in the distance between towns.	The perception of settlements merging will vary depending on factors such as the size of the settlements that are to be kept separate, and whether there are visual factors (e.g. motorway or railway embankments, woodlands, groups of trees or buildings) that might break up a gap or help to define it.	(Q15) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to a significant reduction in the distance between towns?	<a href="#">Q15</a> <a href="#">No – The land forms part of the existing village.</a>
	Prevents continuous ribbon development along transport routes that link towns.	Land proposed for release from the Green Belt is capable of being developed in a sustainable way and readily integrated with the existing built-up area.	(Q16) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development between towns?	<a href="#">Q16</a> <a href="#">Although Barford is semi-rural in character, the land forms part of the existing village and its release would not promote ribbon development between towns.</a>
<b>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</b>	Prevents encroachment through having a strong defensible boundary (and/or topography) between the existing urban area and open countryside.	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q17) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the defensible boundary between the existing urban area and open countryside?	<a href="#">Q17</a> <a href="#">There is currently a domestic curtilage that forms part of the western boundary of this land. The release of the land to accommodate infill development would require a new defensible Green Belt</a>

				<a href="#">boundary to be established along the northern boundary, accompanied by substantial landscaping and tree planting.</a>
	Prevents encroachment through the appropriate use of the Green Belt countryside, including agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses which preserve openness.	The parcel has predominant land uses that are appropriate in the Green Belt; help to preserve its openness; and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. However, the use of land is not as important as the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.	(Q18) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to encroachment due to a loss of an appropriate use? (The NPPF defines appropriate uses.)	<a href="#">Q18</a> <a href="#">The existing use is compatible with the Green Belt and helps to preserve the essential characteristic of openness and there would be some modest encroachment as a result of its loss.</a>
	Prevents encroachment due to its open character, which is not compromised by existing development that would normally be considered inappropriate in the Green Belt, or where there is damaged or derelict land.	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q19) Does the parcel contain development that is not appropriate in the Green Belt and would normally be classed as previously developed land (brownfield site)?	<a href="#">Q19</a> <a href="#">The existing use is appropriate in the Green Belt.</a>
<b>To preserve the special character of historic towns.</b>	Green Belt makes a positive contribution to the setting of an historic town, including strategic views of the town from the open countryside.	Release of designated Green Belt will not significantly harm or detract from views of nearby historic towns, or the surrounding in which an historic town is experienced.	(Q20) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel adversely affect the special character and setting of an historic town?  (Q21) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the significance of an historic town?  'Historic towns' are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth and Stratford Upon Avon for the purposes of this study.	<a href="#">Q20</a> <a href="#">The land and associated natural vegetation contribute to the semi-rural character of the village, but not to the special character or setting of an historic town.</a>  <a href="#">Q21</a> <a href="#">The loss may potentially affect the character of the village, but not the significance of an historic town.</a>
<b>To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</b>	Green Belt in Warwick District is considered to play an important role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban	Development is channelled towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, and towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt, in	(Q22) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, discourage the reuse of brownfield and other land in the urban area?	<a href="#">Q22</a> <a href="#">Although this would be a relatively small infill site, any release of Green Belt land has the potential to discourage the re-use of some brownfield land and other</a>

	<p>land, by restricting the availability of greenfield sites.</p>	<p>order to promote a sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>The extent of Green Belt land is tailored to reflect local circumstances.</p> <p>Consideration is given to whether previously development land in the Green Belt could be put to a more productive use, while protecting openness.</p> <p>Strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Where appropriate, consider the use of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Q23) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel help to undermine the viability of the area to attract appropriate inward investment, including tourism?</p> <p>(Q24) Is there a need for 'Safeguarded Land' on the edge of an urban area, village or hamlet, in order to meet longer-term development needs well beyond the plan period?</p>	<p><a href="#">land in the urban area that may be harder to develop and less attractive to investors. This needs to be carefully assessed and managed by the local planning authority.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q23</a> <a href="#">The release of this land would primarily facilitate a small infill development within the village and if sensitively designed, is unlikely to undermine appropriate inward investment in the area.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q24</a> <a href="#">The designation of 'Safeguarded Land' would not be appropriate for this land, as any development would need to be met within the plan period.</a></p>	
<p><b>To preserve the contribution that the open character of a village or hamlet makes to the openness of the Green Belt. (local criteria).</b></p>	<p>The open character, identity and setting of the individual villages or hamlets, help to preserve the openness of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The 'open' character of the village or hamlet makes an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt and should be included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The general character of the village could be protected by normal development management policies and should be excluded from the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Q25) Does the open character of the village or hamlet make an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q26) If the character of the village or hamlet needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, such as Conservation Area designation or normal development management policies and the village removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q25</a> <a href="#">The built-up area of Barford village is largely excluded from the Green Belt. However, there is some Green Belt land within the village that also makes a contribution to the openness of the Green Belt and open character of the village. The release of this land could have some impact on openness and the character of the village, particularly if any important natural vegetation was not safeguarded.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q26</a> <a href="#">The built-up area of Barford is largely excluded from the Green Belt. However, there is some Green Belt land within the village that also makes a contribution to the openness of the Green Belt and open character of the village. The release of this land would have some impact on the open character of the village and therefore any important natural</a></p>	

				<a href="#">vegetation would need to be safeguarded and enhanced through normal development management and green space policies.</a>	
	Green Belt prevents development that would result in a significant reduction in the distance between villages and hamlets.	The Green Belt land makes an important contribution to preserving the extent and quality of 'openness' between villages and hamlets.	(Q27) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, significantly reduce the distance and quality of Green Belt land separating villages and hamlets in the locality?	<a href="#">Q27</a> <a href="#">As an infill parcel, there would be no reduction in the distance and quality of Green Belt separating villages and/or hamlets.</a>	

**GREEN BELT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PARCELS AND SUB-PARCELS OF LAND (MM)**

**HATTON PARK – G&T Site, Land East of Ugly Bridge Road**

Fundamental Aim of Green Belt	Essential Characteristics of Green Belt	Boundary Review Criteria	Boundary Review Analysis	<u>Boundary Review</u>	Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities
<p><b>To prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</b></p>	<p>Openness is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There is an absence of existing built development, or current planning permissions for inappropriate development.</p> <p>The landscape is predominantly open and rural in character.</p> <p>The openness, character and condition of the Green Belt remain largely intact, with particular reference to the Warwickshire Landscapes Guidelines. Built development would have the potential to significantly affect the open character and visual amenities, whether or not it is visible from public footpaths, bridleways or viewpoints.</p>	<p>(Q1) Is it necessary to keep the parcel of land permanently open to protect the essential characteristic of Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q2) Would development in this parcel be harmful to the open character of the Green Belt, so as to give the appearance of urban sprawl?</p> <p>(Q3) If the character of the area needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, including normal development management policies and the parcel removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><u>Q1:</u>  <a href="#">This relatively small parcel of land is partially contained by Ugly Bridge Road, Birmingham Road (A4177) and the Grand Union Canal (Hatton Locks), including some mature natural vegetation. The land to the north of Birmingham Road is a Preferred Option site that could potentially accommodate a sensitively designed village extension as part of the proposed Hatton village inset, with a modest impact on the fundamental aim, essential characteristics and purposes of the Green Belt. This proposed G&amp;T site could similarly be released from the Green Belt to form part of the village extension, with a relatively modest impact on the essential characteristic of Green Belt.</a></p> <p><u>Q2:</u>  <a href="#">The land is largely contained by substantial and defensible boundaries that could be supplemented by some additional landscaping to help protect the open character of the Green Belt in proximity to the site, particularly when viewed from the Grand Union Canal and public highways. The natural assets, particularly in proximity to the Canal; a provisional Local Wildlife Site (LWS), would also need to be safeguarded and enhanced.</a></p> <p><u>Q3</u>  <a href="#">The identified natural characteristics of the site, particularly the important trees and habitats along the Grand Union</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>



				<p><a href="#">Canal would need to be protected for other reasons i.e. nature conservation, by the use of normal development management policies. Similarly, the existing natural boundary vegetation identified should be protected and integrated into any proposals for development, while having due regard to the relevant Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines. Supplementary boundary treatment and compensatory planting may also be required to minimise any potential urbanisation of the site, while protecting the visual amenities of the Green Belt, particularly when viewed from the open countryside and public viewpoints.</a></p>	
	<p>Permanence is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There are exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Green Belt is associated with readily recognisable physical features which are likely to be permanent e.g. roads, railways, watercourses (canals, rivers and streams), mature natural field boundaries, woodland edges, and topographical features such as ridgelines.</p> <p>The boundary is robust and capable of enduring well beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open has not been included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The boundary meets national policy aims and purposes, while urban and village extensions provide most appropriately for</p>	<p>(Q4) Is this parcel of Green Belt associated with recognisable and permanent physical features?</p> <p>(Q5) Is it possible that the Green Belt boundary may need to be altered at the end of the development plan period?</p> <p>(Q6) Are there any existing or potential threats that may weaken the ability of the Green Belt to endure beyond the plan period, including the potential cumulative impact of major proposals and associated infrastructure?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q4 The land adjoins the Grand Union Canal, Birmingham Road and Ugly Bridge Road, and could potentially form part on an extension to the Hatton Village Inset.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q5 The land is largely contained by readily recognisable and defensible physical features – roads and canal - which are likely to be permanent. The local planning authority, however, should also satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundary would not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period in accordance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. In practice, this means that, once Green Belt boundaries have been defined, they should only be reviewed if the development needs of an area, looking ahead over the long term, clearly cannot be met from within the urban area(s), principally through the recycling of previously developed land.</a></p>	

		sustainable patterns of development and growth.		<a href="#">Q6</a> <a href="#">The local planning authority should satisfy themselves that there are no existing or potential threats that would weaken the ability of any revised Green Belt boundary to endure in this location.</a>	
Green Belt Purpose	Consideration of Green Belt Purpose	Boundary Review Criteria	Boundary Review Analysis		Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities
<b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</b>	Protects urban fringe and open countryside from unplanned built development connected to large built up areas, thus maintaining a clear distinction between urban and rural.	<p>The 'green lung' around the towns and villages will be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>A detailed Green Belt boundary will not be altered merely because the land has become derelict. Consideration will be given to alternative positive Green Belt uses.</p>	<p>(Q7) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development?</p> <p>(Q8) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in an isolated development site not connected to existing boundaries?</p> <p>(Q9) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern?</p> <p>(Q10) Is this Green Belt parcel connected by several boundaries to the built-up area?</p> <p>Large built-up areas are defines as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Rural South and East (integrating Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath, Balsall Common, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Meriden, Hampton-in-Arden, Hockley Heath, Tidbury Green, Catherine-de-Barnes) , Coventry Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon. Solihull Settlement Study defines Rural South and East settlements as stand alone. However, there appears to be a degree of continuation between settlements (Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath).</p>	<p><a href="#">Q7</a> <a href="#">As a relatively contained parcel, the release of this land would not promote ribbon development, although there may be some visual impact in proximity to the Grand Union Canal, particularly during the winter months, when the screening effect of the indigenous vegetation may be reduced.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q8</a> <a href="#">As a self-contained parcel, the release of this land could be relatively isolated. However, the land to the north of Birmingham Road is a Preferred Option site that could potentially accommodate a sensitively designed village extension as part of the proposed Hatton Village Inset, with a modest impact on the fundamental aim, essential characteristics and purposes of the Green Belt. This G&amp;T site could similarly be released from the Green Belt to form part of the village extension, although it may require pedestrian crossing provision on the busy Birmingham Road to improve access to services and facilities, and help promote a more sustainable pattern of development.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q9</a> <a href="#">The release of this of this land from the Green Belt could not reasonably be defined as 'rounding off, although it</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>

				<p><a href="#">could be linked to the Hatton Village Inset Preferred Option.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q10</a>  <a href="#">The land is not currently connected to the built-up area outside the Green Belt, although potentially it could be linked to the Hatton Village Inset, Preferred Option site.</a></p>
	Prevents sprawl where development would not otherwise be restricted by a permanent physical barrier (e.g. roads, railways, watercourses, woodland edge or topographical feature).	Development would be contained by strong physical and visual features, and would not lead to subsequent encroachment.	(Q11) Do recognisable and permanent physical features provide a good barrier between the existing urban area and undeveloped land, which if breached may set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl?	<p><a href="#">Q11</a>  <a href="#">The land is not currently connected to the built-up area outside the Green Belt. However, the parcel is contained by readily recognisable and permanent physical features and therefore its release would be unlikely to set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl, so long as the boundary was reinforced by substantial landscaping to protect the visual amenities of the Green Belt in all seasons.</a></p>
	Prevents development that would result in another settlement being absorbed into a large built up area.	Development is capable of being contained by an existing settlement and strong physical boundaries, and would not lead to 'unrestricted sprawl' into adjoining parcels.	(Q12) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in a small settlement being absorbed into a large built-up area?	<p><a href="#">Q12</a>  <a href="#">The land does not currently form part of a settlement, but is contained by strong physical boundaries. It could also be linked to the Hatton Village Inset, Preferred Option site.</a></p>
	Protects open land contiguous to, or within close proximity to, a large built up area.	The release of Green Belt land would not damage the open character of the Green Belt.	(Q13) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the open land contiguous to, or with close proximity to, the large built up area?	<p><a href="#">Q13</a>  <a href="#">While there would be some loss of green space, the land does not form part of the open countryside and any visual impact on openness could be minimised by a sensitively designed development, combined with substantial landscaping and boundary treatment.</a></p>
<b>Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	Prevents the merger of towns within the Green Belt.	<p>The release of Green Belt land will not damage the substantial open character of the Green Belt separating towns and villages.</p> <p>Any gaps that have to be kept</p>	<p>(Q14) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel increase the potential merging of towns?</p> <p>(Towns are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Major Urban Area and Stratford Upon</p>	<p><a href="#">Q14</a>  <a href="#">Although forming part of the gap separating Hatton and Warwick, the extent of the land release would be relatively modest and contained, and the contribution to the potential merging of towns would be minimal.</a></p>

		open in order to ensure that adjacent settlements do not merge, are identified as essential gaps, regardless of their size or quality.	Avon.)		
	Prevents development that would result in a reduction in the distance between towns.	The perception of settlements merging will vary depending on factors such as the size of the settlements that are to be kept separate, and whether there are visual factors (e.g. motorway or railway embankments, woodlands, groups of trees or buildings) that might break up a gap or help to define it.	(Q15) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to a significant reduction in the distance between towns?	<a href="#">Q15</a> <a href="#">Although part of the gap separating Hatton and Warwick, the extent of the land is relatively modest and contained, and the contribution to the potential merging of towns would be minimal. However, the Local Planning Authority would need to be mindful of any cumulative impact in relation to the Hatton Village Inset Preferred Option Site.</a>	
	Prevents continuous ribbon development along transport routes that link towns.	Land proposed for release from the Green Belt is capable of being developed in a sustainable way and readily integrated with the existing built-up area.	(Q16) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development between towns?	<a href="#">Q16</a> <a href="#">As a relatively contained parcel, the release of this land would not promote ribbon development, although there could be some visual impact in proximity to the Grand Union Canal and Birmingham Road, particularly during winter months, when the screening effect of the indigenous vegetation may be reduced.</a>	
<b>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</b>	Prevents encroachment through having a strong defensible boundary (and/or topography) between the existing urban area and open countryside.	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q17) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the defensible boundary between the existing urban area and open countryside?	<a href="#">Q17</a> <a href="#">The land does not currently form part of an existing settlement, but is contained by strong physical boundaries, which could be supplemented by additional boundary landscaping and potentially linked to the proposed Hatton Village Inset Preferred Option Site.</a>	
	Prevents encroachment through the appropriate use of the Green Belt countryside, including agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses which preserve openness.	The parcel has predominant land uses that are appropriate in the Green Belt; help to preserve its openness; and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. However, the use of land is not as important as the purposes of including land in the Green	(Q18) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to encroachment due to a loss of an appropriate use? (The NPPF defines appropriate uses.)	<a href="#">Q18</a> <a href="#">The existing use of the land does not unduly compromise the openness of the Green Belt.</a>	

		Belt.			
	Prevents encroachment due to its open character, which is not compromised by existing development that would normally be considered inappropriate in the Green Belt, or where there is damaged or derelict land.	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q19) Does the parcel contain development that is not appropriate in the Green Belt and would normally be classed as previously developed land (brownfield site)?	<a href="#">Q19</a> <a href="#">Although there is some hard-standing on the land, the existing use does not unduly compromise the openness of the Green Belt.</a>	
<b>To preserve the special character of historic towns.</b>	Green Belt makes a positive contribution to the setting of an historic town, including strategic views of the town from the open countryside.	Release of designated Green Belt will not significantly harm or detract from views of nearby historic towns, or the surrounding in which an historic town is experienced.	(Q20) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel adversely affect the special character and setting of an historic town?  (Q21) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the significance of an historic town?  'Historic towns' are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth and Stratford Upon Avon for the purposes of this study.	<a href="#">Q20</a> <a href="#">The land and associated natural vegetation contributes to the Warwick approach, particularly when viewed from the Grand Union Canal and the Birmingham Road, but not specifically to the special character or setting of the historic town.</a>  <a href="#">Q21</a> <a href="#">The release of this land from the Green Belt would be unlikely to affect the significance of Warwick as an historic town, providing there was appropriate design sensitivity and supplementary landscaping, having regard to the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines.</a>	
<b>To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</b>	Green Belt in Warwick District is considered to play an important role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, by restricting the availability of greenfield sites.	Development is channelled towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, and towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt, in order to promote a sustainable pattern of development.  The extent of Green Belt land is tailored to reflect local circumstances.	(Q22) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, discourage the reuse of brownfield and other land in the urban area?  (Q23) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel help to undermine the viability of the area to attract appropriate inward investment, including tourism?  (Q24) Is there a need for 'Safeguarded Land' on the edge of an urban area,	<a href="#">Q22</a> <a href="#">Although this would be a relatively modest development site, any release of Green Belt land has the potential to discourage the re-use of some brownfield land and other land in the urban area that may be harder to develop and less attractive to investors. This needs to be carefully assessed and managed by the local planning authority.</a>	

		<p>Consideration is given to whether previously development land in the Green Belt could be put to a more productive use, while protecting openness.</p> <p>Strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Where appropriate, consider the use of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt.</p>	village or hamlet, in order to meet longer-term development needs well beyond the plan period?	<p><a href="#">Q23</a> <a href="#">The release of this land if sensitively designed and landscaped, would be unlikely to undermine appropriate inward investment or tourism (including canal based tourism) in the area.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q24</a> <a href="#">The designation of 'Safeguarded Land' would not be appropriate for this land, as any development would need to be met within the plan period.</a></p>	
<p><b>To preserve the contribution that the open character of a village or hamlet makes to the openness of the Green Belt. (local criteria).</b></p>	<p>The open character, identity and setting of the individual villages or hamlets, help to preserve the openness of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The 'open' character of the village or hamlet makes an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt and should be included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The general character of the village could be protected by normal development management policies and should be excluded from the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Q25) Does the open character of the village or hamlet make an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q26) If the character of the village or hamlet needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, such as Conservation Area designation or normal development management policies and the village removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q25</a> <a href="#">The land does not currently form part of an existing settlement, but is contained by strong physical boundaries, which could be supplemented by additional boundary landscaping and potentially linked to the proposed Hatton Village Inset Preferred Option Site.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q26</a> <a href="#">The land does not currently form part of an existing settlement, but is contained by strong physical boundaries, which could be supplemented by additional boundary landscaping to minimise any potential impact on the openness of the Green Belt, having due regard to the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines. The natural assets of the Grand Union Canal, which is a provisional Local Wildlife Site (LWS), could be safeguarded through the appropriate designation of the LWS and associated development management policies.</a></p>	
	<p>Green Belt prevents development that would result in a significant reduction in the distance between villages and</p>	<p>The Green Belt land makes an important contribution to preserving the extent and quality of 'openness' between villages and hamlets.</p>	<p>(Q27) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, significantly reduce the distance and quality of Green Belt land separating villages and hamlets in the locality?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q27</a> <a href="#">There would be no appreciable reduction in the distance and quality of Green Belt separating villages and/or hamlets, although any development</a></p>	

	hamlets.			<a href="#">may be linked to the proposed Hatton Village Inset Preferred Option Site.</a>	
--	----------	--	--	---	--

**GREEN BELT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PARCELS AND SUB-PARCELS OF LAND (MM)**  
[RADFORD SEMELE – Site 3 Land North of Southam Road \(A425\)](#)

Fundamental Aim of Green Belt	Essential Characteristics of Green Belt	Boundary Review Criteria	Boundary Review Analysis	<u><a href="#">Boundary Review</a></u>	Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities
<p><b>To prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</b></p>	<p>Openness is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There is an absence of existing built development, or current planning permissions for inappropriate development.</p> <p>The landscape is predominantly open and rural in character.</p> <p>The openness, character and condition of the Green Belt remain largely intact, with particular reference to the Warwickshire Landscapes Guidelines. Built development would have the potential to significantly affect the open character and visual amenities, whether or not it is visible from public footpaths, bridleways or viewpoints.</p>	<p>(Q1) Is it necessary to keep the parcel of land permanently open to protect the essential characteristic of Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q2) Would development in this parcel be harmful to the open character of the Green Belt, so as to give the appearance of urban sprawl?</p> <p>(Q3) If the character of the area needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, including normal development management policies and the parcel removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Q1:</a></u>  <a href="#">This relatively small parcel of land is semi-rural in character, adjoining existing built development and is bounded by mature indigenous hedgerows and a main public highway. The release of this land could potentially accommodate a limited village extension, without necessarily compromising the essential characteristics of the Green Belt.</a></p> <p><u><a href="#">Q2:</a></u>  <a href="#">The land is partially bounded by mature hedgerows and trees, which would need to be retained and enhanced as part of a well-designed and sympathetic village extension, to help integrate any development with the surrounding countryside and avoid unduly compromising the open character of the Green Belt so as to give the appearance of urban sprawl. Sensitive design, incorporating vernacular features and indigenous landscaping, would be particularly important in this context to help protect the visual amenities of the Green Belt and minimise the appearance of encroaching urbanisation, while having due regard to the relevant Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines.</a></p> <p><u><a href="#">Q3:</a></u>  <a href="#">If the land is removed from the Green Belt, then normal development management policies would need to be applied in order to provide long-term protection and enhancement for the existing boundary hedgerows and trees that help to soften hard built edges to the open countryside.</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>



	<p>Permanence is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There are exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Green Belt is associated with readily recognisable physical features which are likely to be permanent e.g. roads, railways, watercourses (canals, rivers and streams), mature natural field boundaries, woodland edges, and topographical features such as ridgelines.</p> <p>The boundary is robust and capable of enduring well beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open has not been included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The boundary meets national policy aims and purposes, while urban and village extensions provide most appropriately for sustainable patterns of development and growth.</p>	<p>(Q4) Is this parcel of Green Belt associated with recognisable and permanent physical features?</p> <p>(Q5) Is it possible that the Green Belt boundary may need to be altered at the end of the development plan period?</p> <p>(Q6) Are there any existing or potential threats that may weaken the ability of the Green Belt to endure beyond the plan period, including the potential cumulative impact of major proposals and associated infrastructure?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q4</a> <a href="#">The land is bounded by existing built development; the main A425 Southam Road; and mature indigenous hedgerows and trees.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q5</a> <a href="#">The land has physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. The local planning authority would, however, need to satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundary will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period in accordance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q6</a> <a href="#">The local planning authority should also satisfy themselves that there are no existing or potential threats that would weaken the ability of any revised Green Belt boundary to endure in this location.</a></p>	
<b>Green Belt Purpose</b>	<b>Consideration of Green Belt Purpose</b>	<b>Boundary Review Criteria</b>	<b>Boundary Review Analysis</b>		<b>Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities</b>
<b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</b>	<p>Protects urban fringe and open countryside from unplanned built development connected to large built up areas, thus maintaining a clear distinction between urban and rural.</p>	<p>The 'green lung' around the towns and villages will be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>A detailed Green Belt boundary will not be altered merely because the land has become derelict. Consideration will be given to</p>	<p>(Q7) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development?</p> <p>(Q8) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in an isolated development site not connected to existing boundaries?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q7</a> <a href="#">The parcel adjoins the A425 Southam Road and therefore any development directly fronting onto this road could help to promote the appearance of ribbon development. However, with the predominant retention of this indigenous hedgerow and its long-term protection, management and enhancement in helping</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> </ul>

		alternative positive Green Belt uses.	<p>(Q9) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern?</p> <p>(Q10) Is this Green Belt parcel connected by several boundaries to the built-up area?</p> <p>Large built-up areas are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Rural South and East (integrating Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath, Balsall Common, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Meriden, Hampton-in-Arden, Hockley Heath, Tidbury Green, Catherine-de-Barnes), Coventry Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon. Solihull Settlement Study defines Rural South and East settlements as stand alone. However, there appears to be a degree of continuation between settlements (Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath).</p>	<p><a href="#">to screen any development, any potential visual impact from ribbon development could be minimised.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q8</a> <a href="#">The parcel connects to the built-up edge of Radford Semele along one of its boundaries.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q9</a> <a href="#">The loss of this parcel could not reasonably be defined as 'rounding off' the existing settlement pattern.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q10</a> <a href="#">The parcel is only connected by one boundary to the built-up area.</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>
	Prevents sprawl where development would not otherwise be restricted by a permanent physical barrier (e.g. roads, railways, watercourses, woodland edge or topographical feature).	Development would be contained by strong physical and visual features, and would not lead to subsequent encroachment.	(Q11) Do recognisable and permanent physical features provide a good barrier between the existing urban area and undeveloped land, which if breached may set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl?	<a href="#">Q11</a> <a href="#">There is currently a relatively hard urban edge to the open countryside, which could benefit from further enhancement and landscaping. There is a mature natural boundary along the main A425.</a>	
	Prevents development that would result in another settlement being absorbed into a large built up area.	Development is capable of being contained by an existing settlement and strong physical boundaries, and would not lead to 'unrestricted sprawl' into adjoining parcels.	(Q12) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in a small settlement being absorbed into a large built-up area?	<a href="#">Q12</a> <a href="#">No - The release of this land would constitute a limited village extension.</a>	
	Protects open land contiguous to, or within close proximity to, a large built up area.	The release of Green Belt land would not damage the open character of the Green Belt.	(Q13) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the open land contiguous to, or with close proximity to, the large built up area?	<a href="#">Q13</a> <a href="#">While there would be some loss of open countryside, any impact could be minimised by a well-designed development, combined with sensitive landscaping.</a>	

<b>Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	Prevents the merger of towns within the Green Belt.	<p>The release of Green Belt land will not damage the substantial open character of the Green Belt separating towns and villages.</p> <p>Any gaps that have to be kept open in order to ensure that adjacent settlements do not merge, are identified as essential gaps, regardless of their size or quality.</p>	<p>(Q14) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel increase the potential merging of towns?</p> <p>(Towns are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Major Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon.)</p>	<p><a href="#">Q14</a> <a href="#">No – The release of this land would constitute a limited village extension.</a></p>	
	Prevents development that would result in a reduction in the distance between towns.	<p>The perception of settlements merging will vary depending on factors such as the size of the settlements that are to be kept separate, and whether there are visual factors (e.g. motorway or railway embankments, woodlands, groups of trees or buildings) that might break up a gap or help to define it.</p>	<p>(Q15) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to a significant reduction in the distance between towns?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q15</a> <a href="#">No – The small scale nature of the land release would constitute a limited village extension.</a></p>	
	Prevents continuous ribbon development along transport routes that link towns.	<p>Land proposed for release from the Green Belt is capable of being developed in a sustainable way and readily integrated with the existing built-up area.</p>	<p>(Q16) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development between towns?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q16</a> <a href="#">The parcel adjoins the A425 Southam Road and therefore any development directly fronting onto this road could help to promote the appearance of ribbon development. However, the nearest town to the south-east along this road is Southam, (approximately 5 miles) and with the predominant retention of the roadside indigenous hedgerow and its long-term protection, management and enhancement in helping to screen any development, the potential visual impact of ribbon development could be minimised.</a></p>	
<b>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</b>	Prevents encroachment through having a strong defensible boundary (and/or topography) between the existing urban area and open countryside.	<p>The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.</p>	<p>(Q17) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the defensible boundary between the existing urban area and open countryside?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q17</a> <a href="#">There is currently a relatively hard urban edge to the open countryside, which could benefit from further enhancement and landscaping. There is also a mature natural boundary along the main A425. Any land</a></p>	

				<a href="#">release would need to be accompanied by substantial landscaping boundary treatment to supplement the existing natural boundaries and to promote a new, strong defensible boundary to the open countryside. An integral aspect of any land release in this vicinity should be the enhancement of the remaining Green Belt area in that vicinity through compensatory investment. Such enhancements would need to have regard to the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines.</a>
	Prevents encroachment through the appropriate use of the Green Belt countryside, including agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses which preserve openness.	The parcel has predominant land uses that are appropriate in the Green Belt; help to preserve its openness; and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. However, the use of land is not as important as the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.	(Q18) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to encroachment due to a loss of an appropriate use? (The NPPF defines appropriate uses.)	<a href="#">Q18</a> <a href="#">There would be some loss of agricultural/grazing land.</a>
	Prevents encroachment due to its open character, which is not compromised by existing development that would normally be considered inappropriate in the Green Belt, or where there is damaged or derelict land.	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q19) Does the parcel contain development that is not appropriate in the Green Belt and would normally be classed as previously developed land (brownfield site)?	<a href="#">Q19</a> <a href="#">The existing uses are appropriate in the Green Belt.</a>
<b>To preserve the special character of historic towns.</b>	Green Belt makes a positive contribution to the setting of an historic town, including strategic views of the town from the open countryside.	Release of designated Green Belt will not significantly harm or detract from views of nearby historic towns, or the surrounding in which an historic town is experienced.	(Q20) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel adversely affect the special character and setting of an historic town?  (Q21) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the significance of an historic town?  'Historic towns' are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa,	<a href="#">Q20</a> <a href="#">With the retention of the mature hedgerow along the main A425, together with sensitively designed development and additional boundary landscaping, any impact on the setting of Royal Leamington Spa could be minimised.</a>  <a href="#">Q21</a> <a href="#">With the retention of the mature hedgerow along the main A425, together</a>

			Kenilworth and Stratford Upon Avon for the purposes of this study.	<a href="#">with sensitively designed development and additional boundary landscaping, any potential impact on the significance of Royal Leamington Spa could be minimised.</a>
<b>To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</b>	Green Belt in Warwick District is considered to play an important role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, by restricting the availability of greenfield sites.	<p>Development is channelled towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, and towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt, in order to promote a sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>The extent of Green Belt land is tailored to reflect local circumstances.</p> <p>Consideration is given to whether previously development land in the Green Belt could be put to a more productive use, while protecting openness.</p> <p>Strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Where appropriate, consider the use of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Q22) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, discourage the reuse of brownfield and other land in the urban area?</p> <p>(Q23) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel help to undermine the viability of the area to attract appropriate inward investment, including tourism?</p> <p>(Q24) Is there a need for 'Safeguarded Land' on the edge of an urban area, village or hamlet, in order to meet longer-term development needs well beyond the plan period?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q22</a> <a href="#">Any release of Green Belt land has the potential to discourage the re-use of some brownfield land and other land in the urban area that may be harder to develop and less attractive to investors. This needs to be carefully managed by the local planning authority.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q23</a> <a href="#">As a limited land release, this would primarily constitute a village extension, which if well designed and landscaped, together with appropriate compensatory investment in some additional landscape management adjoining the land, could offer some overall benefits to help offset any potential impact of the development.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q24</a> <a href="#">The designation of 'Safeguarded Land' would not be appropriate for this land, as any development would need to be met within the plan period.</a></p>
<b>To preserve the contribution that the open character of a village or hamlet makes to the openness of the Green Belt. (local criteria).</b>	The open character, identity and setting of the individual villages or hamlets, help to preserve the openness of the Green Belt.	<p>The 'open' character of the village or hamlet makes an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt and should be included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The general character of the village could be protected by normal development management policies and should be excluded from the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Q25) Does the open character of the village or hamlet make an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q26) If the character of the village or hamlet needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, such as Conservation Area designation or normal development management policies and the village removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q25</a> <a href="#">Not applicable as Radford Semele is not included within the Green Belt.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q26</a> <a href="#">Not applicable, as Radford Semele is not included within the Green Belt.</a></p>

	Green Belt prevents development that would result in a significant reduction in the distance between villages and hamlets.	The Green Belt land makes an important contribution to preserving the extent and quality of 'openness' between villages and hamlets.	(Q27) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, significantly reduce the distance and quality of Green Belt land separating villages and hamlets in the locality?	<a href="#">Q27</a> <a href="#">The parcel adjoins the main A425 Southam Road and therefore any development directly fronting onto this road could help to promote the appearance of ribbon development. However, the nearest village along this road is Ufton (approximately 3 miles) and with the predominant retention of this indigenous hedgerow and its long-term protection, management and enhancement in helping to screen any development, the potential visual impact of ribbon development could be minimised and the quality of the openness preserved.</a>	

**GREEN BELT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PARCELS AND SUB-PARCELS OF LAND (MM)**

[RADFORD SEMELE – Site 4 South West Radford Semele](#)

Fundamental Aim of Green Belt	Essential Characteristics of Green Belt	Boundary Review Criteria	Boundary Review Analysis	<u><a href="#">Boundary Review</a></u>	Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities
<p><b>To prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</b></p>	<p>Openness is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There is an absence of existing built development, or current planning permissions for inappropriate development.</p> <p>The landscape is predominantly open and rural in character.</p> <p>The openness, character and condition of the Green Belt remain largely intact, with particular reference to the Warwickshire Landscapes Guidelines. Built development would have the potential to significantly affect the open character and visual amenities, whether or not it is visible from public footpaths, bridleways or viewpoints.</p>	<p>(Q1) Is it necessary to keep the parcel of land permanently open to protect the essential characteristic of Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q2) Would development in this parcel be harmful to the open character of the Green Belt, so as to give the appearance of urban sprawl?</p> <p>(Q3) If the character of the area needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, including normal development management policies and the parcel removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Q1:</a></u>  <u><a href="#">This parcel of land is semi-rural in character, forming part of a green wedge separating Radford Semele and the urban edge of Royal Leamington Spa to the west. The land is bounded by built development to the north and east, and open land to the west and south. The release of this land could potentially accommodate a limited village extension, without unduly compromising the essential characteristics of the Green Belt, although it may result in some narrowing of the green wedge in this location.</a></u></p> <p><u><a href="#">Q2:</a></u>  <u><a href="#">The land is partially bounded by built development and could potentially accommodate a limited village extension so as not to give the appearance of urban sprawl. However, it would be important to integrate any development with the surrounding countryside and avoid unduly compromising the open character of the Green Belt/green wedge. Sensitive design, incorporating vernacular features and indigenous landscaping, would be particularly important in the context to protect the visual amenities of the Green Belt and minimise the appearance of encroaching urbanisation, while having due regard to the relevant Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines. The land between the proposed boundary and the established hedgerows in the immediate vicinity</a></u></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>

				<p><a href="#">could also form part of compensatory landscaping and tree planting, such as a community woodland. Improved public access to the remaining green wedge could also be considered, together with upgrading the landscape and providing for informal recreation and wildlife, as suggested in paragraph 92 of the NPPF.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q3:</a> If the land is removed from the Green Belt, then normal development management and green space policies would need to be applied in order to provide long-term protection and enhancement for the new boundary treatment, to help soften hard built edges to the open countryside.</p>	
	<p>Permanence is an essential characteristic of Green Belt</p>	<p>There are exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Green Belt is associated with readily recognisable physical features which are likely to be permanent e.g. roads, railways, watercourses (canals, rivers and streams), mature natural field boundaries, woodland edges, and topographical features such as ridgelines.</p> <p>The boundary is robust and capable of enduring well beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open has not been included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The boundary meets national policy aims and purposes, while</p>	<p>(Q4) Is this parcel of Green Belt associated with recognisable and permanent physical features?</p> <p>(Q5) Is it possible that the Green Belt boundary may need to be altered at the end of the development plan period?</p> <p>(Q6) Are there any existing or potential threats that may weaken the ability of the Green Belt to endure beyond the plan period, including the potential cumulative impact of major proposals and associated infrastructure?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q4</a> The land adjoins the existing built development along its north and west boundary. However the south and west boundary would be fronting the open land of the green wedge, although there are established hedgerows in proximity to the boundary of the parcel.</p> <p><a href="#">Q5</a> The land is partially bounded by built development. However, additional and substantial landscaping would be necessary in order to establish a long-term defensible boundary. The local authority would also need to satisfy themselves that the Green Belt boundary would not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period in accordance with paragraph 85 of the NPPF. In practice, this means that, once Green Belt boundaries have been defined, they should only be reviewed if the development needs of an area, looking ahead over the long term, clearly cannot be met from within the urban area(s), principally through</p>	



		urban and village extensions provide most appropriately for sustainable patterns of development and growth.		<a href="#">the recycling of previously developed land.</a>  <a href="#">Q6</a> <a href="#">The local planning authority should also satisfy themselves that there are no existing or potential threats that would weaken the ability of any revised Green Belt boundary to endure in this location.</a>	
<b>Green Belt Purpose</b>	<b>Consideration of Green Belt Purpose</b>	<b>Boundary Review Criteria</b>	<b>Boundary Review Analysis</b>		<b>Sustainable Development Constraints and Opportunities</b>
<b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</b>	Protects urban fringe and open countryside from unplanned built development connected to large built up areas, thus maintaining a clear distinction between urban and rural.	<p>The 'green lung' around the towns and villages will be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>A detailed Green Belt boundary will not be altered merely because the land has become derelict. Consideration will be given to alternative positive Green Belt uses.</p>	<p>(Q7) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development?</p> <p>(Q8) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in an isolated development site not connected to existing boundaries?</p> <p>(Q9) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel effectively 'round off' the settlement pattern?</p> <p>(Q10) Is this Green Belt parcel connected by several boundaries to the built-up area?</p> <p>Large built-up areas are defines as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Rural South and East (integrating Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath, Balsall Common, Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green, Meriden, Hampton-in-Arden, Hockley Heath, Tidbury Green, Catherine-de-Barnes) , Coventry Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon. Solihull Settlement Study defines Rural South and East settlements as stand alone. However, there appears to be a degree of continuation between settlements (Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath).</p>	<p><a href="#">Q7</a>  <a href="#">The release of this land would not promote ribbon development.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q8</a>  <a href="#">The parcel connects to the built-up edge of Radford Semele and would form part of a village extension.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q9</a>  <a href="#">The loss of this parcel could not reasonably be defined as 'rounding off' the existing settlement pattern on the edge or Radford Semele. A village extension would be a more accurate description.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q10</a>  <a href="#">The parcel is connected by two boundaries to the built-up area of Radford Semele.</a></p>	<p>This may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood zones</li> <li>• Nature conservation (including SSSI, LNR LWS, AW, ancient hedgerows, TPO and/or veteran trees)</li> <li>• Habitat biodiversity</li> <li>• Landscape character and condition (WLG)</li> <li>• Topography</li> <li>• Geology (including LGS)</li> <li>• Agricultural land classification (1, 2 &amp; 3a)</li> <li>• Accessibility and connectivity</li> <li>• Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological)</li> <li>• The inter-relationship between sustainability constraints</li> <li>• Potential cumulative impact</li> <li>• Positive uses, enhancement and opportunities</li> </ul>

	Prevents sprawl where development would not otherwise be restricted by a permanent physical barrier (e.g. roads, railways, watercourses, woodland edge or topographical feature).	Development would be contained by strong physical and visual features, and would not lead to subsequent encroachment.	(Q11) Do recognisable and permanent physical features provide a good barrier between the existing urban area and undeveloped land, which if breached may set a precedent for unrestricted sprawl?	<a href="#">Q11</a> <a href="#">There is currently a relatively hard urban edge to the open countryside, which could benefit from further enhancement and landscaping. If the land was released, establishing a new defensible boundary together with substantial landscaping and tree planting would be required to help protect the visual amenities of the Green Belt/green wedge.</a>
	Prevents development that would result in another settlement being absorbed into a large built up area.	Development is capable of being contained by an existing settlement and strong physical boundaries, and would not lead to 'unrestricted sprawl' into adjoining parcels.	(Q12) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel result in a small settlement being absorbed into a large built-up area?	<a href="#">Q12</a> <a href="#">There would be some loss of open land, which would result in a narrowing of the green wedge separating Radford Semele and Leamington Spa. However, compensatory upgrading of the landscape and community tree planting could help to ameliorate the impact.</a>
	Protects open land contiguous to, or within close proximity to, a large built up area.	The release of Green Belt land would not damage the open character of the Green Belt.	(Q13) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the open land contiguous to, or with close proximity to, the large built up area?	<a href="#">Q13</a> <a href="#">While there would be some loss of open countryside, any impact could be minimised by a well-designed development, combined with sensitive and extensive compensatory landscaping.</a>
<b>Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b>	Prevents the merger of towns within the Green Belt.	The release of Green Belt land will not damage the substantial open character of the Green Belt separating towns and villages.  Any gaps that have to be kept open in order to ensure that adjacent settlements do not merge, are identified as essential gaps, regardless of their size or quality.	(Q14) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel increase the potential merging of towns?  (Towns are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth, Solihull Major Urban Area and Stratford Upon Avon.)	<a href="#">Q14</a> <a href="#">The release of this land would constitute a limited village extension. However, there would be a perceivable reduction in the Green Belt/green wedge separating Radford Semele and Royal Leamington Spa, which would need to be addressed in any design and compensatory landscaping proposals.</a>
	Prevents development that would result in a reduction in the distance between towns.	The perception of settlements merging will vary depending on factors such as the size of the settlements that are to be kept separate, and whether there	(Q15) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to a significant reduction in the distance between towns?	<a href="#">Q15</a> <a href="#">The release of this land would constitute a limited village extension. However, there would be a perceivable reduction in the Green Belt/green</a>

		are visual factors (e.g. motorway or railway embankments, woodlands, groups of trees or buildings) that might break up a gap or help to define it.		<a href="#">wedge separating Radford Semele and Royal Leamington Spa, which would need to be addressed in any design and compensatory landscaping proposals.</a>
	Prevents continuous ribbon development along transport routes that link towns.	Land proposed for release from the Green Belt is capable of being developed in a sustainable way and readily integrated with the existing built-up area.	(Q16) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to or constitute ribbon development between towns?	<a href="#">Q16</a> <a href="#">No – The release of this land would not promote ribbon development between towns.</a>
<b>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</b>	Prevents encroachment through having a strong defensible boundary (and/or topography) between the existing urban area and open countryside.	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q17) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the defensible boundary between the existing urban area and open countryside?	<a href="#">Q17</a> <a href="#">There is currently a relatively hard urban edge to the open countryside, which could benefit from further enhancement and landscaping. Any land release would need to establish a new defensible boundary to the Green Belt/green wedge, accompanied by substantial landscaping and tree planting. An integral aspect of any land release in this vicinity should also be some enhancement of the remaining Green Belt/green wedge in that vicinity through compensatory investment. Such enhancements would need to have regard to the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines.</a>
	Prevents encroachment through the appropriate use of the Green Belt countryside, including agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other uses which preserve openness.	The parcel has predominant land uses that are appropriate in the Green Belt; help to preserve its openness; and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. However, the use of land is not as important as the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.	(Q18) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel lead to encroachment due to a loss of an appropriate use? (The NPPF defines appropriate uses.)	<a href="#">Q18</a> <a href="#">Some loss of (Grade XX) agricultural land.</a>
	Prevents encroachment due to its open character, which is not compromised by existing development that would normally be	The parcel has a strong defensible boundary that helps to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and facilitate appropriate uses.	(Q19) Does the parcel contain development that is not appropriate in the Green Belt and would normally be classed as previously developed land (brownfield site)?	<a href="#">Q19</a> <a href="#">Existing uses are appropriate in the Green Belt.</a>

	considered inappropriate in the Green Belt, or where there is damaged or derelict land.				
<b>To preserve the special character of historic towns.</b>	Green Belt makes a positive contribution to the setting of an historic town, including strategic views of the town from the open countryside.	Release of designated Green Belt will not significantly harm or detract from views of nearby historic towns, or the surrounding in which an historic town is experienced.	<p>(Q20) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel adversely affect the special character and setting of an historic town?</p> <p>(Q21) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel reduce the significance of an historic town?</p> <p>'Historic towns' are defined as: Warwick, Royal Leamington Spa, Kenilworth and Stratford Upon Avon for the purposes of this study.</p>	<p><a href="#">Q20</a> <u>There would be some reduction in the Green Belt/green wedge separating Radford Semele and Royal Leamington Spa, which may affect the setting of the historic town. However, with the retention of mature hedgerows and trees, together with a sensitive design, compensatory landscaping and tree planting to protect short, medium and long distance views, any impact could be minimised.</u></p> <p><a href="#">Q21</a> <u>With the retention of existing mature hedgerows and trees, sensitive design and compensatory upgrading of the landscape, any potential impact on the historic town could be minimised and possibly enhanced.</u></p>	
<b>To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</b>	Green Belt in Warwick District is considered to play an important role in encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, by restricting the availability of greenfield sites.	<p>Development is channelled towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, and towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt, in order to promote a sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>The extent of Green Belt land is tailored to reflect local circumstances.</p> <p>Consideration is given to whether previously development land in the Green Belt could be put to a more productive use, while protecting openness.</p>	<p>(Q22) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, discourage the reuse of brownfield and other land in the urban area?</p> <p>(Q23) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel help to undermine the viability of the area to attract appropriate inward investment, including tourism?</p> <p>(Q24) Is there a need for 'Safeguarded Land' on the edge of an urban area, village or hamlet, in order to meet longer-term development needs well beyond the plan period?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q22</a> <u>Any release of Green Belt land has the potential to discourage the re-use of some brownfield land and other land in the urban area that may be harder to develop and less attractive to investors. This would need to be carefully managed by the local planning authority.</u></p> <p><a href="#">Q23</a> <u>As a limited land release, this would primarily constitute a village extension, which if well designed and combined with countryside management opportunities within the Green Belt/green wedge to upgrade the landscape, improve public access and provide for informal recreation and</u></p>	

		<p>Strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Where appropriate, consider the use of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt.</p>		<p><a href="#">wildlife, could offer some overall net benefits to help offset any potential impact of the development.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q24</a>  <a href="#">The designation of 'Safeguarded Land' would not be appropriate for this land, as any development would need to be met within the plan period.</a></p>	
<p><b>To preserve the contribution that the open character of a village or hamlet makes to the openness of the Green Belt. (local criteria).</b></p>	<p>The open character, identity and setting of the individual villages or hamlets, help to preserve the openness of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The 'open' character of the village or hamlet makes an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt and should be included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The general character of the village could be protected by normal development management policies and should be excluded from the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Q25) Does the open character of the village or hamlet make an important contribution to the 'openness' of the Green Belt?</p> <p>(Q26) If the character of the village or hamlet needs to be protected for reasons other than Green Belt, could other means be used, such as Conservation Area designation or normal development management policies and the village removed from the Green Belt?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q25</a>  <a href="#">Not applicable as Radford Semele is not included within the Green Belt.</a></p> <p><a href="#">Q26</a>  <a href="#">Not applicable, as Radford Semele is not included within the Green Belt.</a></p>	
	<p>Green Belt prevents development that would result in a significant reduction in the distance between villages and hamlets.</p>	<p>The Green Belt land makes an important contribution to preserving the extent and quality of 'openness' between villages and hamlets.</p>	<p>(Q27) Would the loss of this Green Belt parcel, significantly reduce the distance and quality of Green Belt land separating villages and hamlets in the locality?</p>	<p><a href="#">Q27</a>  <a href="#">There would be no major reduction between villages and/or hamlets resulting from this land release, although there would be some reduction in the Green Belt/green wedge separating Radford Semele and Royal Leamington Spa/Sydenham.</a></p>	