

# Sustainability Appraisal of the North Warwickshire Growth Options Paper and Scoping Update

- 1.1 This note presents the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Growth Options Paper that has been prepared by North Warwickshire Borough Council to support the emerging Local Plan. This note also updates the SA Scoping work that has been undertaken previously in relation to the emerging North Warwickshire Local Plan (previously the Local Development Framework (LDF)).

## Background to the SA of the Growth Options Paper

- 1.2 North Warwickshire Borough Council adopted its Core Strategy in October 2014. That document set out the strategy and overall housing and employment land requirements for the Borough up to 2029. The Council has also been preparing a Site Allocations Plan and a Development Management Plan, and intends to bring those documents together to form a comprehensive new Local Plan. The adopted Core Strategy will also be brought forward into the new Local Plan, with some of the policies amended or updated as required. The new Local Plan will be extended to cover the period up to 2031.

### Housing requirements

- 1.3 One of the key issues that the Council must address through the new Local Plan is the increased housing requirement for the Borough which has been identified since the Core Strategy was adopted. The Core Strategy provided for the development of 3,150 new homes in the Borough between 2011 and 2029, as well as an additional 500 homes to provide for unmet housing need from Tamworth Borough. This resulted in a total annual housing requirement of 203 dwellings over the Plan period. However, since the Core Strategy was adopted, recent evidence has indicated that the new Local Plan will need to deliver at least 5,280 dwellings over the period 2011-2031, which equates to an annual requirement of 264 homes. This is a minimum figure and provides for the needs of North Warwickshire Borough, plus an allowance for Tamworth Borough and redistribution from Coventry and Warwickshire. There will a requirement to provide additional housing to meet some of the unmet need from Birmingham City, and emerging indications are that an additional 3,790 homes may be required in North Warwickshire for this reason. This would therefore represent a significant increase in the housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.

### Employment land requirements

- 1.4 In terms of employment land, the Core Strategy provided for 60ha over the Plan period; however this was based on the assumption that 2ha of land at Spring Hill Industrial Estate, Arley would be lost from employment use. As this site has in fact remained in full employment use, the employment land requirement is reduced to 58ha. The updated Employment Land Review found that this figure would be sufficient to support the minimum housing growth figure of 5,280; however if further housing growth is proposed to meet Birmingham City's unmet need, additional employment land will be required to support this.

### The Growth Options Paper

- 1.5 The Growth Options Paper considers the issues and challenges associated with providing for additional housing (and potentially employment land) over and above the level set out in the Core Strategy. It identifies alternative options for how the required growth could be delivered - five

options are presented for delivering the growth required within the Borough, and five for dealing with growth required from outside of the Borough. These options are shown in **Table 1** below.

**Table 1: Options for delivering the growth required in North Warwickshire Borough**

Options for growth generated from within the Borough	Options to deal with growth from outside the Borough
IN1: Development in accordance with the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy.	OUT1: Development against the relevant borough, district or city boundary.
IN2: Development in and around the Main Settlements. This option includes Coleshill, the Green Belt Market Town.	OUT2: Develop in and around the closest settlements.
IN3: Focus development along the A5 Corridor.	OUT3: Add the housing to the overall North Warwickshire Borough figures and distribute according to the preferred option for the whole of the Local Plan.
IN4: Development around transport hubs.	OUT4: Development around public transport hubs.
IN5: New settlement.	OUT5: New settlement.

- 1.6 This SA note presents the findings of the appraisal of these 10 options, considering the likely significant positive and negative effects of each and identifying ways in which the sustainability benefits of the options could be maximised and the potential negative impacts mitigated.
- 1.7 Although options IN5 and OUT5 are essentially the same, they have been subject to SA separately within each group of options as the likely sustainability effects of a new settlement for meeting housing need from outside of the Borough (OUT5) will differ in some ways from the likely effects of a new settlement which meets only housing need from within North Warwickshire (IN5).

## Approach to the SA

- 1.8 The options set out in **Table 1** above have been subject to SA in line with the approach taken previously to the SA of the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management Plans. Two separate SA matrices have been prepared, one for each of the sets of five options, and each option has been appraised against each of the 20 SA objectives in the North Warwickshire SA framework. An individual score has been given to each option in relation to each SA objective, to indicate whether positive or negative effects are likely and whether these are likely to be minor or significant. The key to the scoring system used is shown in **Figure 1** below.

**Figure 1 Key to symbols and colour coding used in the SA of the North Warwickshire Growth Options Paper**

++	The option is likely to have a <b>significant positive</b> effect on the SA objective(s).
++/-	The option is likely to have a mixture of <b>significant positive</b> and <b>minor negative</b> effects on the SA objective(s).
+	The option is likely to have a <b>positive</b> effect on the SA objective(s).
0	The option is likely to have a <b>negligible</b> or no effect on the SA objective(s).
-	The option is likely to have a <b>negative</b> effect on the SA objective(s).
-/+	The option is likely to have a mixture of <b>significant negative</b> and <b>minor positive</b> effects on the SA objective(s).
--	The option is likely to have a <b>significant negative</b> effect on the SA objective(s).
?	It is <b>uncertain</b> what effect the option will have on the SA objective(s).
+/- or +/-	The option is likely to have an equal mixture of <b>both minor or both significant positive and negative</b> effects on the SA objective(s).

- 1.9 The justification column in the SA matrices provides a commentary in relation to the scores given and identifies the reasons behind any uncertainties in the likely effects identified. Possible mitigation measures for potential negative effects identified are also described where relevant.
- 1.10 The detailed SA matrices for the options can be found in **Appendix 3**.

## Scoping update

- 1.11 North Warwickshire Borough Council prepared and consulted on a Draft Scoping Report for the Local Development Framework (LDF) in 2006<sup>1</sup>. That document established the scope of the SA work that would be undertaken in relation to each of the documents that would comprise the LDF (which was later replaced by the new Local Plan).
- 1.12 The Draft Scoping Report was subject to consultation with the statutory consultation bodies that existed at the time – Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage (now Historic England).
- 1.13 The Scoping stage involved the following tasks:
- Identification and review of other relevant policies, plans, programmes, strategies and initiatives which may influence the content of the LDF (now the Local Plan).
  - Gathering baseline information about the environmental, social and economic characteristics of North Warwickshire Borough.
  - Identification of the key sustainability issues facing North Warwickshire.
  - Development of a framework of SA objectives against which the LDF (now the Local Plan) would be appraised.
- 1.14 Although the Council is now preparing a new-style Local Plan instead of the LDF that was previously being prepared, the scope of the documents and the associated SA work is broadly the same and therefore the SA Scoping work has remained relevant to the preparation of the Local Plan. In recognition of the time that has passed and the rapidly evolving evidence base and policy context for plan preparation, the Scoping work that was originally prepared in 2006 has been regularly revised and updated since then as part of the SA work that has been undertaken for the Core Strategy, the Site Allocations Plan and the Development Management Plan. The

<sup>1</sup> North Warwickshire Borough Council (October 2006) Draft Scoping Report - Sustainability Appraisal & Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Local Development Framework.

updated Scoping work has been presented in the various SA reports that have been consulted on alongside different iterations of each plan and any comments received from statutory and other consultees in relation to the Scoping tasks have been addressed as appropriate.

- 1.15 Reflecting the need for consistency with the previous SA work undertaken, it is anticipated that the SA work for the Growth Options Paper and the next stage of SA work on the Draft Local Plan will be undertaken in broadly the same way as the earlier SA work, i.e. referring to similar (although updated) baseline information and making use of the same SA framework. However, in order to ensure that the statutory consultees have had the opportunity to comment on the scope of the SA work for the combined new Local Plan, this note presents the outputs of the Scoping stage of the SA and comments are invited on the appropriateness of this to inform the SA of the new Local Plan.

### Review of plans, policies and programmes

- 1.16 North Warwickshire's Local Plan is not prepared in isolation, being greatly influenced by other plans, policies and programmes and by broader sustainability objectives. It needs to be consistent with international and national guidance and strategic planning policies and should contribute to the goals of a wide range of other programmes and strategies, such as those relating to social policy, culture and heritage. It must also conform to environmental protection legislation and the sustainability objectives established at an international, national and sub-regional level.
- 1.17 An up-to-date review has been undertaken of the other plans, policies and programmes that are relevant to the Local Plan. This review is based on the work that was undertaken for the SA of the emerging Development Management Plan, which was most recently presented in the September 2015 SA Report for the Draft Policies version. The policy review has been updated since then and refined to ensure that it is relevant to the SA of the Local Plan.
- 1.18 The review of relevant plans, policies and programmes can be seen in full in **Appendix 1** and the key findings are summarised below.
- 1.19 Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires:
- (1) *"an outline of the...relationship with other relevant plans or programmes"; and*
- (5) *"the environmental protection objectives established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation"*
- 1.20 It is necessary to identify the relationships between North Warwickshire's Local Plan and the relevant plans, policies and programmes so that any potential links can be built upon and any inconsistencies and constraints addressed.

#### *Key international plans, policies and programmes*

- 1.21 At the international level, Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (the 'SEA Directive') and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (the 'Habitats Directive') are particularly significant as they require Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be undertaken in relation to the emerging North Warwickshire Local Plan. These processes should be undertaken iteratively and integrated into the production of the plan in order to ensure that any potential negative environmental effects (including on European-level nature conservation designations) are identified and can be mitigated.
- 1.22 There are a wide range of other EU Directives relating to issues such as water quality, waste and air quality, most of which have been transposed into UK law through national-level policy; however the international directives have been included in **Appendix 1** for completeness.

#### *Key national plans, policies and programmes*

- 1.23 The most significant development in terms of the policy context for North Warwickshire's Local Plan has been the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 which replaced the suite of Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs). The purpose of the NPPF was to streamline national planning policy, having reduced over a thousand pages of policy down to around 50 pages. The Local Plan must be consistent with the

requirements of the NPPF. The NPPF sets out information about the purposes of local plan-making, stating that:

*"Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end, they should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in this Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development."*

- 1.24 The NPPF also requires Local Plans to be 'aspirational but realistic'. This means that opportunities for appropriate development should be identified in order to achieve net gains in terms of sustainable social, environmental and economic development; however significant adverse impacts in any of those areas should not be allowed to occur.
- 1.25 The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:
- the homes and jobs needed in the area;
  - the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
  - the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
  - the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
  - climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.
- 1.26 In addition, Local Plans should:
- plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework;
  - be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date;
  - be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public, voluntary and private sector organisations;
  - indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map;
  - allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate;
  - identify areas where it may be necessary to limit freedom to change the uses of buildings, and support such restrictions with a clear explanation;
  - identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance; and
  - contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, and supporting Nature Improvement Areas where they have been identified.
- 1.27 National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides further guidance on national level planning policy. It sets out guidance on a wide range of issues that are relevant to development management, including in relation to topics such as flood risk, the natural environment, climate change and waste. The NPPG also provides additional guidance in relation to the preparation of Local Plans and the need for SA/SEA. The emerging North Warwickshire Local Plan must be in conformity with the higher level policy established in the NPPF.

#### *Local plans, policies and programmes*

- 1.28 At the sub-regional and local levels there are a wide range of plans and programmes that are specific to Warwickshire and North Warwickshire Borough, and which provide further context for the emerging Local Plan. These plans and programmes have also been reviewed in **Appendix 1**. A key document of relevance to the preparation of the Local Plan is the North Warwickshire

Sustainable Community Strategy (2009-2026) which sets out a vision for rural North Warwickshire in 2026 and three key priorities for improving quality of life in the Borough:

- Raising aspirations, educational attainment and skills;
- Developing healthier communities; and
- Improving access to services.

1.29 Policies in the Local Plan should be prepared in the context of these aims and offer good opportunities to contribute to improving quality of life in North Warwickshire by bringing about high quality new development.

### Baseline information

1.30 Baseline information provides the context for assessing the sustainability of proposals in North Warwickshire's Local Plan and it provides the basis for identifying trends, predicting the likely effects of the plan and monitoring its outcomes. The requirements for baseline data vary widely, but it must be relevant to environmental, social and economic issues, be sensitive to change and should ideally relate to records which are sufficient to identify trends.

1.31 Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires data to be gathered on biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors. As an integrated SA and SEA is being carried out, baseline information relating to other 'sustainability' topics has also been included; for example information about housing, social inclusiveness, transport, energy, waste and economic growth. As with the review of relevant plans, policies and programmes, the baseline information for North Warwickshire was previously presented in the September 2015 SA Report for the Development Management Plan. Since then, a small number of amendments have been made to the baseline information in order to ensure that it remains up to date and appropriate for informing the SA of the Local Plan. The baseline information is presented in **Appendix 2**.

### Key sustainability issues

1.32 Key sustainability issues for North Warwickshire have been identified through the policy review and collation of baseline information. These are issues that the Local Plan should seek to address where possible, bringing about improvements in trends.

- An aging population coupled with a declining birth rate.
- The need to improve biodiversity assets, including designated nature conservation sites, especially the condition of SSSIs.
- High house prices.
- The need to improve unsuitable properties.
- The need to reduce the fear of crime.
- Varying levels of access to key services, especially for residents in the more isolated rural areas of the Borough.
- Relatively high levels of income deprivation and low income levels.
- Relatively high levels of health deprivation and higher than the national average mortality rates.
- Low levels of qualification and educational attainment.
- The need to protect Local Geological Sites (LoGS).
- The need to improve river quality.
- The need to protect and enhance air quality.
- The need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.
- High levels of flood risk in some areas.

- High levels of waste generation and lower rate of recycling in relation to the rest of the county.
- Water supply and waste water capacity issues may pose restrictions to development in some locations.
- Reliance on fossil fuels for energy generation.

### SA framework

- 1.33 Development of an SA framework is not a requirement of the SEA Directive; however it provides a recognised way in which the likely sustainability effects of a plan can be clearly described, analysed and compared. An SA framework comprises a series of SA objectives and supporting criteria that are used to appraise the policies and proposals within a plan.
- 1.34 The SA framework that has been used throughout the appraisal of the adopted Core Strategy, and the Site Allocations and Development Management Plans to date, and which is considered suitable for use in the SA of the Growth Options Paper and the Draft Local Plan, is presented in **Table 2** below (this was originally presented in the 2006 Scoping Report for the LDF).

**Table 2: SA Framework for the North Warwickshire Local Plan**

SA Objectives
1. Equal access to services, facilities and opportunities for all, regardless of income, age, health, disability, culture or ethnic origin.
2. Developing and supporting vibrant and active communities and voluntary groups, who are able to express their needs and take steps towards meeting them.
3. Tackling health inequalities and improve health by supporting local communities and by improving access and raising awareness.
4. Providing decent and affordable housing to meet local needs.
5. Reducing crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour.
6. Providing opportunities to participate in recreational and cultural activities.
7. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the assets of the natural environment of North Warwickshire, including landscape character.
8. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment, including the cultural heritage.
9. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the biodiversity of North Warwickshire.
10. Ensuring development makes efficient use of previously developed land, buildings and existing physical infrastructure in sustainable locations.
11. Maintaining the resources of air, water and productive soil, minimising pollution levels.
12. Minimising North Warwickshire's contribution to the causes of climate change whilst implementing a managed response to its unavoidable impacts.
13. Reducing overall energy use through sustainable design, increasing energy efficiency and increasing the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources.
14. Using natural resources efficiently.
15. Increasing use of public transport, cycling and walking and reducing use of the private car.
16. Encouraging and enabling waste minimisation, reuse, recycling and recovery to divert resources away from the waste stream.
17. Encouraging local sourcing of goods and materials.
18. Creation of a modern, healthy and diverse economy which is able to adapt to changes in the wider economy while remaining relevant to the needs of local people.
19. Maintaining and enhancing employment opportunities and reducing the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs.
20. Ensuring that people of all ages are provided with the opportunity to obtain the skills, knowledge, confidence and understanding to achieve their full potential.

## SA findings for the Growth Options Paper

### Options for growth generated within the Borough

1.35 A brief summary of each of the five options is provided below

- **IN1: Development in accordance with the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy** would result in more than 50% of the housing and employment requirements being provided within or adjacent to the market towns of Atherstone with Mancetter and Polesworth with Dordon. After this, development would be directed within the development boundary of the Green Belt market town of Coleshill, followed by local service centres (first those outside of the Green Belt and then those within it) and other settlements with a development boundary. The smallest amount of development would be directed outside of these settlements. This approach overall would result in development being fairly dispersed throughout the Borough, although with little in the very south. This option would not involve the release of land from the Green Belt.
- **IN2: Development in and around the Main Settlements including Green Belt Market Town** would focus almost all of the development required at the market towns, including Coleshill. This approach differs from the Core Strategy approach in that it allows for development in the Green Belt around Coleshill instead of requiring all development to be within the development boundary. Under this option, development outside of the market towns would be very limited.
- **IN3: Focus growth along the A5 corridor** would direct all development along the corridor of the A5 which runs between the north western and eastern parts of the Borough, past Dordon, Atherstone and Mancetter. The A5 corridor is outside of the Green Belt.
- **IN4: Development around public transport hubs** would involve development being dispersed fairly widely around the Borough, around public transport hubs including existing hubs (such as the railway stations at Atherstone, Coleshill Parkway and Water Orton), expected provision (HS2 interchange) and potential provision (including new or reopened railway stations at Polesworth, Kingsbury and Arley).
- **IN5: New settlement** would involve developing a new and relatively self-contained settlement, to include commercial land and services and facilities alongside housing. Although some high level criteria for search areas are identified, no specific locations within the Borough are proposed. The search criteria include a minimum size of at least 4,000-5,000 homes and accessibility to key transport routes.

1.36 **Table 2** below presents the SA scores for the five options for growth generated within North Warwickshire.



**Table 2 Summary of SA findings for the options for growth generated within the Borough**

SA objective	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5
1. Access to services	+/-	++/-	+/-	+/-	++/-
2. Vibrant and active communities	+	0	0	+	++
3. Health	+/-	++	++/-	++/-	++
4. Housing	--?	++?/-	--?	++?	-?
5. Crime	0	0	0	0	0
6. Recreation and culture	+/-	++/-	+/-	+/-	++
7. Landscape	+/--?	--?	+/-?	--?	--?
8. Cultural heritage	--?	--?	--?	--?	-?
9. Biodiversity	-?	-?	-?	-?	+/--?
10. Efficient use of land and infrastructure	+/-?	++?	+	-/++	--
11. Air, water and soil pollution	+/-	+/--	+/-	+/-	+/--?
12. Climate change	+/-	++/-	-	+	++?
13. Energy efficiency	0	0	0	0	0
14. Use of natural resources	0	0	0	0	0
15. Sustainable transport	+/-	++	+/-	++	++
16. Waste	0	0	0	0	0
17. Local sourcing of goods	0	0	0	0	0
18. Economy	0	0	0	0	0
19. Employment	+/-	++/-	+/-	++/-	++/-
20. Skills	0	0	0	0	0

- 1.37 The effects of the five options on the SA objectives are broadly very mixed, reflecting the range of advantages and disadvantages associated with focussing development at the larger towns or dispersing it more widely throughout the Borough. These issues are exemplified in the range of effects identified for **SA objective 1: access to services** and **SA objective 6: recreation and culture**. Focussing most development at the larger Market Towns (under option IN2 and to a lesser extent, IN1) would mean that most people are easily able to access the services and facilities (including recreational and cultural facilities) located there; however it could also result in those services and facilities becoming overloaded unless new provision is made. It could also mean that opportunities to stimulate improvements to services in the smaller settlements elsewhere in the Borough are lost. Similarly, under option IN4 the proximity of development to public transport links would provide easy access to services and facilities, including for people without a car; however the development would be dispersed and in some cases would be on the periphery of settlements so further from services and facilities which tend to be centrally located. Option IN5 would have the most positive effects as the development of a stand-alone new settlement with services and facilities alongside new housing would ensure that new residents have easy access and the potential for existing facilities to become overloaded should be avoided.
- 1.38 The distribution of growth will not have a strong influence on **SA objective 2: vibrant and active communities**, although developing a new settlement with employment land and services alongside new housing under option IN5 would have a significant positive effect as this approach would support the creation of balanced communities and should avoid a new settlement becoming a dormitory town. Options IN1 and IN4 would have minor positive effects because they would both provide for at least some development in the smaller and more rural communities in the Borough, which could stimulate their viability and vitality. In contrast, options IN2 and IN3 would focus most or all development in and around the larger towns so this benefit would not occur.
- 1.39 The effects of the options on **SA objective 3: health** depend largely on the extent to which they would provide opportunities for walking and cycling, as well as the access that they would provide to healthcare facilities. Option IN5 would have a significant positive effect as providing jobs, services and facilities (assumed to include GP provision) alongside housing should mean that more people are able to walk and cycle day to day. Option IN2 would also have a significant positive effect because almost all development would be at the Market Towns where access to existing healthcare facilities should be good and journeys should generally be shorter, which could enable more active travel. The effects of the other three options are mixed as, although they would allow for some use of active travel (particularly options IN3 and IN4), option IN3 could also

result in high levels of car use and options IN1 and IN4 would allow some development in the smaller settlements, where car use is likely to be high and access to healthcare facilities limited.

- 1.40 Similarly, the effects of the five options on **SA objective 12: climate change** and **SA objective 15: sustainable transport** are also influenced by the extent to which they will result in car use. The effects on these objectives are most positive where options would focus almost all development at the Market Towns under IN2 as day-to-day journeys are likely to be shorter and public transport links better, and where development would be focused at public transport hubs (IN4). The effects of IN5 are also positive as co-locating employment development and services and facilities alongside new housing should enable more people to walk and cycle day to day. Effects on SA objective 12 are also influenced by the extent to which options would affect flood risk – this is difficult to assess until specific location come forward, although all of the options could involve at least some development in areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 – this is probably least likely under IN3. Also closely related to these SA objectives is **SA objective 11: air, water and soil pollution**, as the effects on air quality are in part influenced by the extent of likely car use. However, effects are also influenced by the proximity of new development to the AQMA that has been declared at Coleshill – option IN2 in particular would direct a significant amount of new development there which could compound air quality issues. SA objective 11 also considers impacts on the loss of productive soils - this would potentially be most negatively affected by option IN5 which would involve the loss of a large area of greenfield land for a new settlement, although the location in relation to the highest quality soils in the Borough is not yet known.
- 1.41 Options IN1 and IN3 could have significant negative effects on **SA objective 4: housing** as they may not provide enough land to meet the increased housing need for North Warwickshire. However, in both cases the effects are uncertain until the updated SHLAA is published and the exact housing target is known. Option IN5 could have a minor negative effect as other sites may be required at least in the short term to meet the five year housing land supply, although longer term this option could provide enough land. If options IN2 and IN4 would provide enough housing land to meet North Warwickshire’s needs (which cannot be determined with certainty at this stage) then they would be likely to have significant positive effects, although option IN2 would have a mixed effect overall as this option would involve very limited housing provision outside of the Market Towns and so may not meet the housing needs of smaller communities elsewhere.
- 1.42 The likely effects of the options on **SA objective 7: landscape** are difficult to determine until specific development sites are identified; however options IN1, IN2, IN4 and IN5 could all have significant negative effects. Options IN2 and IN4 would require the release of land from the Green Belt which could have negative effects on the openness and character of the area and contribute towards settlement coalescence, although it is recognised that Green Belt land isn’t always the most sensitive or high quality in landscape terms. IN1 would direct development to settlements that have already seen substantial growth, which could affect their character and form. However, the effects of option IN1 are mixed overall, as almost all development would be located at the Market Towns and away from the more sensitive rural parts of the Borough. Option IN5 would result in the loss of a large area of greenfield land for the development of a new settlement which is likely to have significant landscape impacts although it is not possible to assess this in detail until the location is known, in particular its proximity to the Green Belt. It is also noted that a new settlement location could be selected to minimise landscape impacts. Option IN3 would focus development along the A5 corridor which is well outside of the Green Belt; however this approach could result in a continuous thread of urban development along the A5 corridor, affecting local character.
- 1.43 The effects of all five options on **SA objective 8: cultural heritage** and **SA objective 9: biodiversity** are uncertain and cannot be determined until the design and specific location of development is known. However, the scale of development resulting from the options means that in all cases negative effects are possible. Focussing most development closer to the built up areas of the Borough under options IN1, IN2, IN3 and IN4 could mean that impacts on features such as listed buildings are more likely; therefore significant negative effects are likely for those options. IN5 could have a minor negative effect as development is less likely to be close to a large number of heritage assets, if the choice of location seeks to avoid heritage rich areas. However, that option could have a significant negative effect on biodiversity as it would involve large-scale development on greenfield land while the other options could be less likely to affect

biodiversity, focussing most development closer to built-up areas although there is still likely to be some development on greenfield land, particularly under option IN2. Overall, the effects of option IN5 are mixed, however, as the development of a new settlement may offer good opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure enhancements and it may be possible to select a new settlement location to avoid areas of particular biodiversity interest.

- 1.44 The effects of the five options on **SA objective 10: efficient use of land and infrastructure** are very varied. Under Options IN1 and IN2 most development would be focussed at the Market Towns which could mean that there are more opportunities to redevelop brownfield sites, although IN2 would involve at least some development on greenfield land around Coleshill. Development would also be generally well-connected with existing physical infrastructure in the most sustainable locations under those options. However, option IN1 still allows for a reasonable amount of development in other parts of the Borough where the opposite could be said. Option IN3 would focus all new development along the A5 corridor where there are likely to be reasonable opportunities for reusing brownfield sites; however while this part of the Borough is well-connected in terms of the road network, this does not necessarily make it the most sustainable location. Under Option IN4, more dispersed development is likely to be on the edge of settlements in many cases and so is not expected to offer good opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites; however the development would be very well connected to existing sustainable transport infrastructure. Under Option IN5 a new settlement would be developed which it is assumed would be entirely or largely remote from existing physical infrastructure and would require significant new infrastructure development to support it. It is also likely to be mainly if not entirely on greenfield land.
- 1.45 In relation to **SA objective 19: employment**, the same amount of employment land would be provided under all five options; however the spatial distribution of development will influence how easily people are able to access jobs. The effects of option IN5 are most positive as the new settlement would include employment development alongside new housing which would be accessible and proportional to support the increased demand. However, this approach would mean that (depending on the location of the new settlement) the new employment land and opportunities may be remote from residents in existing towns and villages, limiting access for them. The significant positive effect is therefore mixed with a minor negative effect. The other four options would also all have mixed effects. Under Option IN2 and to a lesser extent IN1, most development would be at the Market Towns where the jobs created would be relatively accessible for most people. IN1 still allows for some development at smaller settlements where any jobs created may be less accessible, particularly for people without a car; however it would also mean that new jobs are distributed more widely within the Borough instead of being focussed in only a few locations. Focussing most development along the A5 corridor (option IN3) could mean that access to jobs for people in other parts of the Borough is poor. Conversely, under option IN4 development would be more dispersed and well connected to the public transport network which would mean that more people are able to access jobs in other parts of the Borough, including those without a car. However it may also mean that some employment land could be developed in areas that are more remote from the main centres of population.
- 1.46 The effects of all five options on the remaining SA objectives are negligible, in most cases because the achievement of the SA objectives would not be affected by the spatial location of development. In relation to SA objective 14: **use of natural resources**, it is not possible to identify differences between the options in terms of the extent to which they could result in the sterilisation of mineral resources, because of the wide extent of Minerals Safeguarding Areas which cover almost the whole Borough.

### *Summary*

- 1.47 Options IN2 and IN5 would have more significant positive effects than the other options, most of which relate to the social and economic objectives.
- 1.48 The social and economic objectives are generally affected well by option IN2, which would focus most development at the more built up parts of the Borough, although the fact that this option would require development in the Green Belt could have negative effects on the landscape, depending upon its quality. This approach demonstrates the potential opportunities for building on and expanding existing settlements where most homes and jobs already exist, and where the identity of the settlements and their neighbourhoods have been long established. This approach

would also make best use of existing services, facilities and other infrastructure, stimulating their ongoing viability and potential expansion. However, it would be essential that additional provision is made to support population growth, in order to avoid existing services becoming overloaded.

- 1.49 Under option IN5 (new settlement), co-locating housing with services, facilities and commercial land should create an integrated new community designed with sustainability principles in mind from the outset, and encouraged to develop in a relatively self-contained way. This would help to reduce the need to travel, increasing levels of walking and cycling, as well as benefitting community cohesion. However, the large-scale development on greenfield land that would occur under option IN5 means that the approach could have more negative effects on the environmental SA objectives in comparison to the other options although these effects are largely uncertain until potential locations for a new settlement can be considered. It should also be recognised that a new settlement could take a significant amount of time to plan and deliver, not least the time required to identify an appropriate site where environmental impacts can be minimised and the sustainability benefits maximised, for example through proximity to transport links. It will also require a significant amount of investment in completely new infrastructure, including community services and facilities as well as transport and utilities infrastructure. It will take time to develop a critical mass. For these reasons, this option would not be able to meet the Borough's predicted increased housing target, at least in the short term, which could be a barrier to the viability of the option.
- 1.50 IN1 would have largely mixed effects, reflecting the combination of positive and negative effects that would result from focussing most development at the larger towns – while this has a range of benefits in relation to issues such as sustainable transport use and accessibility to jobs and services, there is also the potential for activity to be drawn away from smaller and more rural settlements which could affect their viability.
- 1.51 IN3 and IN4 would also have largely mixed effects; however the fact that those options would not provide enough land to meet the level of housing need expected to be identified in North Warwickshire is a significant barrier to their viability. The mixed effects of option IN3 reflect the advantages and disadvantages of concentrating development in one part of the Borough, while the mixed effects of IN4 are largely associated with the fact that although development would be well-connected via public transport, much of it would be located outside of the main built up areas in the Borough.

### Options for growth generated outside of the Borough

- 1.52 A brief summary of each of the five options is provided below
- **OUT1: Development against the relevant borough, district or city boundary** would focus the additional development narrowly along the western and southern edges of North Warwickshire (in most cases on the side of the motorways closest to the other districts), outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the other districts but as close as possible to the districts for which the additional housing is being provided. Based on interpretation of the mapped existing settlement pattern, for the purposes of the SA it is assumed that it wouldn't be possible to develop meaningful extensions within North Warwickshire to the settlements in those other districts (it may be possible for those other districts to plan to expand relevant settlements in their district to integrate with development provided in North Warwickshire but this has not been assumed in the SA).
  - **OUT2: Develop in and around the closest settlements** would also locate the additional development around the western and southern parts of the Borough, although it would be slightly further from the district boundaries and would be located at the settlements within North Warwickshire that are nearest to the relevant other districts.
  - **OUT3: Add the housing to the overall North Warwickshire Borough figures and distribute according to the preferred option for the whole of the emerging draft Local Plan** would depend on the option selected for dealing with the needs of the Borough.
  - **OUT4: Develop around public transport hubs** would be similar to option IN4 in that it would involve development being dispersed fairly widely around the Borough, focussed at locations with existing, planned or proposed public transport links.

- **OUT5: New settlement** would be the same as option IN5, so it would involve developing a new and relatively self-contained settlement, to include commercial land and services and facilities alongside housing.

1.53 **Table 3** below presents the SA scores for the five options for growth generated outside of North Warwickshire.

**Table 3 Summary of SA findings for the options for growth generated outside of the Borough**

SA objective	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5
1. Access to services	+/-	++/-	?	+/-	++/-
2. Vibrant and active communities	-	+	+?	+	++
3. Health	+/-	+/-	?	++/-	+
4. Housing	++	+	?	-	?
5. Crime	0	0	0	0	0
6. Recreation and culture	+/-	++/-	?	+/-	++/-
7. Landscape	--?	--?	?	--?	--?
8. Cultural heritage	-?	--?	?	-?	-?
9. Biodiversity	-?	-?	?	-?	--/+?
10. Efficient use of land and infrastructure	--/+	++/-	?	-/+	--
11. Air, water and soil pollution	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	+/-?
12. Climate change	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	+/-?
13. Energy efficiency	0	0	0	0	0
14. Use of natural resources	0	0	0	0	0
15. Sustainable transport	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	+/-?
16. Waste	0	0	0	0	0
17. Local sourcing of goods	0	0	0	0	0
18. Economy	0	0	0	0	0
19. Employment	+/-	+/-	?	--/+	+/-?
20. Skills	0	0	0	0	0

- 1.54 As with the options for growth generated within the Borough, the effects of these five options on the SA objective are very mixed and will in many cases depend on the specific development locations, particularly the location of a new settlement under option OUT5. In most cases, the effects of option OUT3 are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.
- 1.55 In relation to **SA objective 1: access to services** and **SA objective 6: recreation and culture**, the effects of Options OUT2 and OUT5 are the most positive as those options would focus development closest to the other districts for which housing is being provided and therefore access to services in those districts may be easiest. However, in both cases the effects are mixed overall - under OUT1 development would be outside of existing settlements in both North Warwickshire and the adjacent districts, so people may need to travel further to access services day to day, and in the case of OUT2 there is potential for the additional demand to overload services and facilities in North Warwickshire's settlements if new provision is not made. Focussing development around public transport hubs throughout the Borough under OUT4 would provide people with good access to services and facilities in locations around the Borough and further afield; however distances to services and facilities in the other districts would be long in some cases.
- 1.56 Option OUT5 could have a significant positive effect on **SA objective 2: vibrant and active communities** as a new settlement would be developed as a self-contained community with services and employment opportunities alongside the new housing which would contribute to the creation of a thriving and sustainable new community, although it is noted that the creation of this community would take considerable time to plan, develop and for community identity to emerge. The purpose of the additional housing would be to meet the needs of other districts, so people are still likely to commute for work and other activities which could affect the overall cohesion and vitality of the new settlement, resulting in uncertainty whether the significant positive effects would be achieved. Options OUT2, OUT3 and OUT4 could all have minor positive effects - under options OUT2 and OUT3, development for adjacent authorities would be well

integrated within settlements in North Warwickshire so people may perceive themselves more as part of those communities and part of the wider Borough, and more dispersed development under option OUT4 could have a positive effect on the creation of vibrant and active communities in rural areas as more development would take place there. Option OUT1 could have a minor negative effect as providing housing for other districts in peripheral areas of North Warwickshire, adjacent to the districts for which the housing is required. This could mean that people living and working in those areas do not perceive themselves as part of North Warwickshire and do not integrate within the Borough's communities but at the same time are not properly integrated within communities in the other districts (the housing provided along the periphery of the district boundaries would in most cases be a similar distance from communities in North Warwickshire and the other districts although this cannot be determined in more detail until specific development locations are known).

- 1.57 The effects of the options on **SA objective 3: health** are determined by the extent to which they would allow for walking and cycling and the access that they would provide to healthcare facilities. Option OUT1 would focus development close to the boundaries of the other districts so people may be able to cycle to work there; however the fact that the development would be outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the other districts could mean that levels of car use are high and access to nearby healthcare facilities limited. Conversely, option OUT2 would locate development within settlements in North Warwickshire, which could mean that access to healthcare facilities is better but people are less likely to be able to cycle to work in other districts due to the longer distances. Option OUT4 would focus development around public transport hubs which may benefit health as a result of reduced air pollution from car use and people may be more likely to undertake part of their journey on foot or by bicycle; however the longer distances from some of the development locations to the other districts could have the opposite effect and increase car use. Developing a self-contained new community under option OUT5 should mean that some people are able to live and work in close proximity and therefore undertake more journeys day-to-day on foot or by bicycle, benefitting health, although as the housing would be meeting the needs of other districts it is expected that a lot of people would still commute to work elsewhere which would have the opposite effect.
- 1.58 In relation to **SA objective 4: housing**, option OUT1 would focus the housing required to meet the needs of other districts around the boundary of North Warwickshire Borough, adjacent to the boundary of the district for which the housing is required. This would mean that it is functionally linked to those districts and should more effectively meet their needs, although not physically linked to existing settlements as it would still be outside of the main settlements within those districts. Option OUT2 would focus development at the nearest settlements in North Warwickshire to the other districts, creating a physical link with existing settlements, and it would still be functionally linked (especially as transport links may be slightly better), although it would be slightly further from the other districts. Option OUT4 would distribute development more widely across North Warwickshire and some of the housing would therefore be located far from the districts that it is being provided for. The effects of Option OUT5 are uncertain and would depend largely on the location of the new settlement in relation to the districts for which housing is being provided and to what extent it would meet their needs by being functionally linked.
- 1.59 The effects of the options on **SA objective 7: landscape** are largely uncertain until specific development sites come forward. Options OUT1, OUT2 and OUT4 would all require some development within the Green Belt which could have a significant negative effect on the landscape in terms of reducing open space and risking the coalescence of urban areas, although it is recognised that Green Belt land is not necessarily the most sensitive in landscape terms. It is also noted that not all of the closest settlements that would receive development under OUT2 could accommodate potentially large amounts of development in their existing forms, so this approach could significantly alter the character and shape of those settlements. Option OUT5 could also have significant landscape impacts as the development of an entirely new settlement would be largely if not entirely on greenfield land and could be prominent visually, depending on its location. This option could also require the release of land from the Green Belt; however effects cannot be assessed in detail until the location is known.
- 1.60 The effects on **SA objective 8: cultural heritage** and **SA objective 9: biodiversity** are again largely uncertain until specific sites for development are identified. However, the scale of development proposed under all options could have negative effects on heritage assets and their

settings or on biodiversity. Under Option OUT1, although not physically linked to existing settlements, development would be focussed along the western and southern edges of North Warwickshire Borough, where there is already extensive urbanisation including the M42 and M6 motorways. This would reduce the potential for new development to adversely affect the setting of heritage features although adverse effects may still occur. Option OUT2 would locate development at the settlements in North Warwickshire closest to other districts; therefore it may be more likely to impact upon features such as listed buildings which tend to be more concentrated in built up areas, and also settlement setting and character. Dispersed development under option OUT4 would have largely uncertain effects, depending on the location of specific development sites, although it is expected that there would be heritage assets in the towns and villages that could be affected by new development, particularly if this option were to stimulate additional transport infrastructure development. A new settlement under Option OUT5 would direct development away from existing built up areas and therefore may be less likely to impact upon the setting of heritage features such as listed building although there may still be valuable heritage assets in rural areas that would be affected by the new development depending on its location, including on the setting of heritage interest in what are likely to be open locations. However, a new settlement location could be selected to avoid such interest features.

- 1.61 In relation to biodiversity, option OUT1 would focus development along the very edge of North Warwickshire's western and southern boundaries, outside of the main settlements; therefore it may be more likely to take place on greenfield land and result in habitat loss or disturbance to species. However, the presence of the M42 and other urbanisation in this area is likely to limit the potential for such effects as there may already be existing high levels of habitat degradation and disturbance. Similarly, option OUT4 would also be likely to require development on greenfield land. Under Option OUT2, development would be at existing settlements which may reduce the likelihood of habitat loss or disturbance to species, although some of the development would still be on greenfield sites and built up areas can also harbour valuable biodiversity. The development of a new settlement under Option OUT5 is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land, which could impact upon biodiversity depending on the nature and value of the land; however a new settlement could offer good opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure which would benefit biodiversity and it may be possible to select a site which avoids sensitive habitats and species.
- 1.62 The effects of the options on **SA objective 10: efficient use of land and infrastructure** are very mixed. Option OUT1 is likely to result in the development of greenfield land as development would be focussed outside of the main settlements in North Warwickshire and the adjacent districts. This would also mean that it is less well-connected via existing infrastructure and it is noted that additional transport infrastructure might be needed to connect developments with the settlements in the adjacent districts. However, in terms of geographical proximity, development would be well-connected to the other districts. Under Option OUT2 development would be located at the closest settlements in North Warwickshire to the district boundaries, so may offer some opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites in built up areas although it is not currently clear from the available evidence exactly how much brownfield land is available. However, Green Belt land would need to be released and most development is still likely to be on greenfield sites. Under this option, however, development would be better connected via public transport infrastructure to the other districts compared to OUT1 (although it is noted that the closest settlements may not currently allow for commuting via public transport), while still being reasonably close geographically. Existing settlements also represents a more sustainable location for new development. Under Option OUT4, development would be focussed at public transport hubs around the Borough. This dispersed development is not expected to offer good opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites; however the development would be very well connected to existing and potential sustainable transport infrastructure. Under Option OUT5 a new settlement would be developed which it is assumed would be entirely or largely remote from existing physical infrastructure and would require significant new infrastructure development to support it. It is also likely to be mainly if not entirely on greenfield land.
- 1.63 The effects of the options on **SA objective 11: air, soil and water** are again very mixed. Under Option OUT1 levels of air pollution from car use could be high as development would be located outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the neighbouring districts and would therefore be unlikely to be well-connected via public transport. However, locating development in North Warwickshire close to the border with other districts could mean that

commuting distances to jobs and services there would be smaller, potentially enabling people to cycle. Development would also be located outside of the AQMA that has been declared at Coleshill although there would be some development within reasonably close proximity of the town which may increase traffic there. However, the option is likely to result in the development of greenfield sites which could result in the loss of high quality soils, particularly because the area where development would take place is largely Grade 3 agricultural land, with some Grade 2 land. Option OUT2 would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs and services in the other districts but may have better public transport links which could reduce air pollution from car use. However, journeys would be slightly longer and opportunities to walk and cycle are therefore likely to be limited. In addition, development would be located at Coleshill where an AQMA has been declared, which could compound air pollution in that area. The option would result in the development of greenfield sites which could result in the loss of high quality soils - as with OUT1, the area where development would take place is largely Grade 3 land with some Grade 2. Option OUT4 would focus development at public transport hubs around the Borough which is likely to encourage the use of non-car based modes of transport, to the benefit of air quality. However, under this option some development would be located a long way from the districts whose need it is proposed to meet so journeys may be longer and more likely to be undertaken by car. In addition, some development is directed towards the AQMA at Coleshill under this option. The dispersed nature of development under this option means that it is difficult to assess the likely impacts on soils until specific development sites are known; however some development is directed to the central and northern parts of the Borough where high quality soils are found and the fact that development would take place outside of the largest towns could increase the likelihood of productive agricultural soils being lost. A new settlement under option OUT5 would mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day and the associated air pollution. However, as the housing is being proposed to meet the needs of other districts, people are still likely to commute elsewhere for work and for social activities which may be by car. In addition, the development of a new settlement would involve the loss of a large area of greenfield land which could be high quality agricultural soil, depending on the location which is not yet known, although avoiding high quality soils could be a factor in identifying an appropriate site. Similarly, the proximity of the new settlement to the AQMA at Coleshill is not known.

- 1.64 The effects of the options on **SA objective 12: climate change** and **SA objective 15: sustainable transport** are similar, as the main way in which the options will affect climate change is through the extent to which they would result in car use. The effects are also closely linked to those described above in relation to air quality. Under option OUT1 levels of car use could be high as development would be located outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the neighbouring districts; however locating development close to the border with other districts could mean that there are opportunities to cycle to work there. Option OUT2 would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs and services in the other districts but could have better public transport links. However, journeys would be slightly longer and opportunities to walk and cycle are therefore likely to be limited. Under Option OUT4 some development would be located quite far distance from the districts which it is proposed for, which could mean that levels of car use are higher; however focussing development around public transport hubs could improve levels of sustainable transport use. The development of a new settlement under option OUT5 should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day. However, as the housing being provided would be to meet the needs of other districts, it is assumed that people would still largely commute to work and for social activities elsewhere which may be by car depending on the location of the new settlement. Effects on SA objective 12 are also influenced by the extent to which options would affect flood risk – this is difficult to assess until specific location come forward, although all of the options could involve at least some development in areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3. Under OUT5 it should be possible to select a location for a new settlement based on avoiding high flood risk areas.
- 1.65 In relation to **SA objective 19: employment**, Option OUT1 would direct development closer geographically for people commuting to other districts for work, although the fact that the development would be outside of the main settlements in North Warwickshire could mean that accessibility for those without a car is less good, depending on the extent to which public



transport provision would be integrated into the new developments and linked to settlement destinations in other districts as well as with North Warwickshire settlements. Option OUT2 would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs in the other districts but are likely to have better public transport links which could improve access for those without a car. However, journeys would be slightly longer and the housing less functionally linked to employment in other districts. Under option OUT4 development could be located some distance from the districts which it is proposed for, which could mean that it is difficult for people to access employment there if this requires commuting longer distances. However, focussing development around public transport hubs could improve access to jobs for people without cars. Option OUT5 would involve the development of a new settlement, with commercial development to be provided alongside housing. This would ensure that jobs are provided for the growing population, in a location that is accessible from the new homes even for people without cars. However, as the housing being provided would be to meet the needs of other districts, it is assumed that people would still largely commute to work elsewhere and depending on the location of the new settlement, this distance could be either short or long.

- 1.66 The effects of all five options on the remaining SA objectives are negligible, in most cases because the SA objectives would not be affected by the spatial location of development. In relation to SA objective 14: **use of natural resources**, it is not possible to identify differences between the options in terms of the extent to which they could result in the sterilisation of mineral resources, because of the wide extent of Minerals Safeguarding Areas which cover almost the whole Borough.

#### *Summary*

- 1.67 In general, the effects of OUT1 and OUT2, both of which would focus development closer to the boundaries of the districts for which it is being provided, are generally likely to have the most positive effects on the SA objectives. Compared to the other options, the housing and employment development would be more functionally linked to the other districts and distances to be travelled for commuting are likely to be shorter. However, under OUT1 effects will depend to some extent on how well public transport infrastructure is integrated into the developments as the location of development outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and other districts could mean that existing connections are more limited than under OUT2. Given administrative boundaries and the existing settlement pattern it may be more difficult under OUT1 to integrate development at the periphery of North Warwickshire with settlements in other districts whereas under OUT2 opportunities will be available to integrate development with existing settlements in North Warwickshire.
- 1.68 The effects of OUT3 cannot be assessed in any detail without a preferred option for the distribution of North Warwickshire's housing need having been identified; however the principle of locating additional development for other districts along with that provided to meet the needs of the Borough itself may benefit community cohesion and ensure that residents are integrated as part of the Borough's communities.
- 1.69 The effects of OUT4 are similar to those of IN4, representing a balance between the advantages of locating development close to public transport links and the potential disadvantages of development being dispersed throughout the Borough. However, for OUT4 there is also the issue that the housing provided is to meet the needs of other districts and in some cases, development under this option would be located far from those districts which could result in difficulty accessing jobs and services there and could encourage high levels of car use.
- 1.70 In contrast to the options considered for meeting housing need from within North Warwickshire Borough, the option of providing a new settlement (OUT5) to meet housing need from outside of the Borough does not have the same number of likely significant effects on the SA objectives. This is because where housing is being provided to meet the needs of other districts, the proximity and connectivity to those districts is key and the benefits of a self-contained new settlement may not be as clear. Although providing jobs alongside new housing could offer good opportunities for shorter journeys and lower levels of car use, if the purpose of the housing is to meet the need of other districts it is most likely that people will continue to commute elsewhere for employment as well as some social activities.

- 1.71 As with the 'IN' options, in many cases the potential effects identified are uncertain and will depend on the specific locations of development sites that are identified under each option. Decision making regarding which options to take forward to meet the needs of other districts may also depend on proposals in the neighbouring districts' Local Plan, for example if it is possible to take an integrated approach, e.g. developing an urban extension to a settlement outside of North Warwickshire that is partly located across the North Warwickshire Borough boundary, taking into account potential barriers to expansion such as the motorway network.

## Next steps

- 1.72 The SA findings set out in this note should be taken into account by North Warwickshire Borough Council as it decides which options to take forward in the Local Plan.
- 1.73 Once the Draft Local Plan has been prepared, the policies in that document will also need to be subject to SA and the findings presented in a full SA report for consultation alongside the Local Plan.

LUC  
June 2016

**Appendix 1**  
Review of Plans, Policies and Programmes

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<b>INTERNATIONAL</b>				
<b>EU Directives</b>				
<p><i>SEA Directive 2001</i></p> <p>Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment</p>	<p>Provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development.</p>	<p>The Directive must be applied to plans or programmes whose formal preparation begins after 21 July 2004 and to those already in preparation by that date.</p>	<p>The policies included in the Local Plan, and reasonable alternative options, must be subject to SEA as the Plan is prepared.</p>	<p><b>Requirements of the Directive must be met in Sustainability Appraisal.</b></p>
<p><i>The Industrial Emissions Directive 2010</i></p> <p>Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)</p>	<p>This Directive lays down rules on integrated prevention and control of pollution arising from industrial activities. It also lays down rules designed to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to reduce emissions into air, water and land and to prevent the generation of waste, in order to achieve a high level of protection of the environment taken as a whole.</p>	<p>The Directive sets emission limit values for substances that are harmful to air or water.</p>	<p>Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objective relating to reducing pollution.</p>
<p><i>Energy Performance of Buildings Directive 2010 on the energy performance of buildings 2010/31/EU</i></p>	<p>The Directive aims to promote the energy performance of buildings and building units.</p> <p>It requests that member states adopt either national or regional methodology for calculating energy performance and minimum requirements for energy performance.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Should take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include SA objective relating to the energy performance/efficiency of existing and proposed buildings.</p>
<p><i>The Birds Directive 2009</i></p> <p>Directive 2009/147/EC is a codified version of</p>	<p>The preservation, maintenance, and re-establishment of biotopes and habitats shall include the following measures:</p> <p>Creation of protected areas.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Make sure that the upkeep of recognised habitats is maintained and not damaged from</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives for the protection of birds.</p>

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
Directive 79/409/EEC as amended	Upkeep and management in accordance with the ecological needs of habitats inside and outside the protected zones.  Re-establishment of destroyed biotopes.  Creation of biotopes.		development.  Avoid pollution or deterioration of habitats or any other disturbances effecting birds.	
<i>The Waste Framework Directive 2008</i>  Directive 2008/98/EC on waste	Prevention or reduction of waste production and its harmfulness. The recovery of waste by means of recycling, re-use or reclamation. Recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without using processes that could harm the environment.	Development of clean technology to process waste and promote recycling.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to waste minimisation and the promotion of recycling.
<i>The Air Quality Directive 2008</i>  Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe	Avoid, prevent and reduce harmful effects of ambient noise pollution on human health and the environment.	No targets or indicators.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to air quality.
<i>The Floods Directive 2007</i>  Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks	Establish a framework for the assessment and management of flood risks, aiming at the reduction of the adverse consequences for human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activity associated with floods.	Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments to be completed by December 2011. Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps to be completed by December 2013. Flood Risk Management Plans to be completed by December 2015.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to flood management and reduction of risk.
<i>The Water Framework Directive 2000</i>  Directive 2000/60/EC	Protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwaters.	No targets or indicators.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived	Include sustainability objectives relating to water quality.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
establishing a framework for community action in the field of water policy			from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	
<i>The Landfill Directive 1999</i> Directive 99/31/EC on the landfill of waste	Prevent or reduce negative effects on the environment from the landfilling of waste by introducing stringent technical requirements for waste and landfills.	Reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill to 75% of the 1995 level by 2010. Reduce this to 50% in 2013 and 35% by 2020.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to waste.
<i>The Drinking Water Directive 1998</i> Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human consumption	Protect human health from the adverse effects of any contamination of water intended for human consumption by ensuring that it is wholesome and clean.	Member States must set values for water intended for human consumption.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to water quality.
<i>The Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive 1994</i> Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste	Harmonise the packaging waste system of Member States. Reduce the environmental impact of packaging waste.	By June 2001 at least 50% by weight of packaging waste should have been recovered, at least 25% by weight of the totality of packaging materials contained in packaging waste to be recycled with a minimum of 15% by weight for each packaging material.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to waste minimisation and the promotion of recycling.
<i>The Habitats Directive 1992</i> Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of	Promote the maintenance of biodiversity taking account of economic, social, cultural and regional requirements. Conservation of natural habitats and maintain landscape features of importance to wildlife and fauna.	No targets or indicators.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to biodiversity, including European sites.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
wild fauna and flora				
<i>The Nitrates Directive 1991</i> Directive 91/676/EEC on nitrates from agricultural sources.	Reduce water pollution caused or induced by nitrates from agricultural sources and prevent further such pollution.	Identification of vulnerable areas.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to water pollution.
<i>The Urban Waste Water Directive 1991</i> Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste water treatment	Protect the environment from the adverse effects of urban waste water collection, treatment and discharge, and discharge from certain industrial sectors.	No targets or indicators.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to water pollution.
<b>European</b>				
European Spatial Development Perspective (1999)	Economic and social cohesion across the community. Conservation of natural resources and cultural heritage. Balanced competitiveness between different tiers of government.	No targets or indicators.	Take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to the conservation of natural resources and cultural heritage as well as socio-economic issues.
EU Seventh Environmental Action Plan (2002-2012)	The EU's objectives in implementing the programme are: (a) to protect, conserve and enhance the Union's natural capital; (b) to turn the Union into a resource-efficient, green and competitive low-carbon economy; (c) to safeguard the Union's citizens from environment-related pressures and risks to health and wellbeing; (d) to maximise the benefits of the Union's	No targets or indicators.	Develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives relating to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment and the promotion of energy efficiency.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>environment legislation;</p> <p>(e) to improve the evidence base for environment policy;</p> <p>(f) to secure investment for environment and climate policy and get the prices right;</p> <p>(g) to improve environmental integration and policy coherence;</p> <p>(h) to enhance the sustainability of the Union's cities;</p> <p>(i) to increase the Union's effectiveness in confronting regional and global environmental challenges.</p>			
European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2002)	The convention promotes landscape protection, management and planning.	No indicators or targets.	Take account of the Convention.	Include sustainability objectives relating to protecting the quality and character of the landscape.
European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Valletta, 1992) <i>Revision of the 1985 Granada Convention</i>	<p>Protection of the archaeological heritage, including any physical evidence of the human past that can be investigated archaeologically both on land and underwater.</p> <p>Creation of archaeological reserves and conservation of excavated sites.</p>	No indicators or targets.	Take account of the Convention.	Include sustainability objectives relating to protecting archaeological heritage.
<b>International</b>				
Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable	Commitment to building a humane, equitable and caring global society aware of the need for human dignity for all.	<p>Greater resource efficiency.</p> <p>New technology for renewable energy.</p>	Take account of the Declaration.	Include sustainability objectives relating to a range of sustainability issues, including



Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
Development (2002)	Renewable energy and energy efficiency. Accelerate shift towards sustainable consumption and production.	Increase energy efficiency.		enhancing the natural environment and promoting renewable energy and energy efficiency.
Aarhus Convention (1998)	Established a number of rights of the public with regard to the environment. Local authorities should provide for:  The right of everyone to receive environmental information  The right to participate from an early stage in environmental decision making  The right to challenge in a court of law public decisions that have been made without respecting the two rights above or environmental law in general.	No targets or indicators.	Take account of the Convention.	Ensure that public are involved and consulted at all relevant stages of the SA and Plan production.
<b>NATIONAL</b>				
National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance	Presumption in favour of sustainable development.  Delivering sustainable development by:	No targets or indicators.	Development plan has a statutory status as the starting point for decision making.	Sustainability Appraisal should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.
	Building a strong, competitive economy.	No targets or indicators.	Set out clear economic visions for that particular area.	Include a sustainability objective relating to strengthening the economy.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	Ensuring vitality of town centres.	No targets or indicators.	Recognise town centres as the heart of their communities.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the vitality of town centres.
	Promoting sustainable transport	No targets or indicators.	To implement sustainable transport modes depending on nature/location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure.	Include a sustainability objective relating to sustainable transport.
	Supporting high quality communications infrastructure.	No targets or indicators.	Enhance the provision of local community facilities and services by supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks.	Include a sustainability objective relating to improving communication.
	Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.	No targets or indicators.	Identify size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations.	Include a sustainability objective relating to housing availability and quality.
	Requiring good design.	No targets or indicators.	Establish a strong sense of place to live, work and visit.	Include a sustainability objective relating to good design.
	Promoting healthy communities.	No targets or indicators.	Promote safe and accessible environments with a high quality of life and community cohesion.	Include a sustainability objective relating to health and well-being.
	Protecting Green Belt Land.	No targets or indicators.	To prevent the coalescence of neighbouring towns.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the coalescence of towns.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding, and coastal change.	No targets or indicators.	Use opportunities offered by new development to reduce causes/impacts of flooding.	Include a sustainability objective relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation.
	Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.	No targets or indicators.	Recognise the wider benefits of biodiversity.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.
	Conserving and enhancing the historic environment	No targets or indicators.	Sustain and enhance heritage assets and put them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation of historic features.
	Facilitating the use of sustainable materials.	No targets or indicators.	Encourage prior extraction of minerals where practicable and environmentally feasible.	Include a sustainability objective relating to sustainable mineral extraction.
National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)	<p>Achieving the sustainable management of waste through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency, including provision of modern infrastructure, local employment opportunities and wider climate change benefits, by driving waste management up the waste hierarchy;</li> <li>- ensuring that waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns, such as housing and transport, recognising the positive contribution that waste management can make to the</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators.	Any DM policies relating to waste should be consistent with national policy.	Include a sustainability objective relating to sustainable waste management.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>development of sustainable communities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- providing a framework in which communities and businesses are engaged with and take more responsibility for their own waste, including by enabling waste to be disposed of or, in the case of mixed municipal waste from households, recovered, in line with the proximity principle;</li> <li>- helping to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment; and</li> <li>- ensuring the design and layout of new residential and commercial development and other infrastructure (such as safe and reliable transport links) complements sustainable waste management, including the provision of appropriate storage and segregation facilities to facilitate high quality collections of waste.</li> </ul>			
<b>White Papers</b>				
<p>Natural Environment White Paper, 2011</p> <p><i>The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature</i></p>	<p>Protecting and improving our natural environment;</p> <p>Growing a green economy; and</p> <p>Reconnecting people and nature.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Protect the intrinsic value of nature and recognise the multiple benefits it could have for communities.</p>	<p>Include a sustainability objective relating to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.</p>
<p>Electricity Market Reform White Paper 2011, <i>Planning our Electric Future: A White Paper for Secure, Affordable and</i></p>	<p>This White Paper sets out the Government's commitment to transform the UK's electricity system to ensure that our future electricity supply is secure, low-carbon and affordable.</p>	<p>15 per cent renewable energy target by 2020 and 80 per cent carbon reduction target by 2050.</p>	<p>Support renewable energy generation and encourage greater energy efficiency.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives relating to reducing carbon emissions and increasing the proportion of energy generated from renewable</p>

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<i>Low-Carbon Electricity</i>				sources.
<p>Water White Paper, 2011</p> <p><i>Water for Life</i></p>	<p>Objectives of the White Paper are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paint a clear vision of the future and create the conditions which enable the water sector and water users to prepare for it;</li> <li>• Deliver benefits across society through an ambitious agenda for improving water quality, working with local communities to make early improvements in the health of our rivers by reducing pollution and tackling unsustainable abstraction;</li> <li>• Keep short and longer term affordability for customers at the centre of decision making in the water sector;</li> <li>• Protect the interests of taxpayers in the policy decisions that we take;</li> <li>• Ensure a stable framework for the water sector which remains attractive to investors;</li> <li>• Stimulate cultural change in the water sector by removing barriers to competition, fostering innovation and efficiency, and encouraging new entrants to the market to help improve the range and quality of services offered to customers and cut business costs;</li> <li>• Work with water companies, regulators and other stakeholders to build understanding of the impact personal choices have on the water environment, water resources and costs; and</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators.	Support the wise use of water, and improvement of water quality.	Include sustainability objectives that relate to water quality and quantity.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set out roles and responsibilities – including where Government will take a stronger role in strategic direction setting and assessing resilience to future challenges, as well as clear expectations on the regulators.</li> </ul>			
<p>The Future of Transport White Paper 2004: A network for 2030</p>	<p>Ensure we can benefit from mobility and access while minimising the impact on other people and the environment, now and in the future.</p> <p>Get the best out of our transport system without damaging our overall quality of life.</p> <p>Develop strategies that recognise that demand for travel will increase in the future.</p> <p>Work towards a transport network that can meet the challenges of a growing economy and the increasing demand for travel but can also achieve the government’s environmental objectives.</p>	<p>20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2010 and 60% reduction by 2050. Transport is currently responsible for about a quarter of total emissions.</p>	<p>Promote public transport use rather than increasing reliance on the car.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives relating to reducing the need to travel and improving choice and the use of sustainable transport modes.</p>
<p>Urban White Paper 2000, <i>Our Towns and Cities: The Future – delivering an urban renaissance</i></p>	<p>New Sustainable homes that are attractive, safe and practical. Retaining people in urban areas and making them more desirable places to live. Improving quality of life, opportunity and economic success through tailored solutions in towns and cities.</p>	<p>3.8 million more homes needed by 2021. Local strategies needed to meet the needs of local people developed through partnerships. 60% of new homes on brownfield sites or through conversions of existing buildings.</p>	<p>Allocate sites that will effectively deliver better towns and cities taking into account the key aims of the White Paper.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives relating to encouraging development on brownfield sites and improving the quality of the built environment.</p>
<p>Rural White Paper 2000, <i>Our Countryside: The Future – a fair deal</i></p>	<p>Facilitate the development of dynamic, competitive and sustainable economies in the countryside.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Seek to increase employment and services in the rural parts of the</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives that aim to improve the economies of</p>

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<i>for rural England</i>	<p>Maintain and stimulate communities and secure access to services for those who live and work in the countryside.</p> <p>Conserve and enhance rural landscapes.</p> <p>Increase opportunities for people to get enjoyment from the countryside.</p>		Borough whilst conserving the landscape.	rural areas with minimal impact on the environment.
<b>Policies and Strategies</b>				
DCLG (2015) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites	<p>Government's aims in respect of traveller sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning.</li> <li>• To ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites.</li> <li>• To encourage local planning authorities to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale.</li> <li>• That plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.</li> <li>• To promote more private traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites.</li> <li>• That plan-making and decision-taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that relevant considerations are taken into account for policies that could influence the development of Traveller sites.	Include relevant sustainability objectives relating to social inclusion and environmental protection.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies.</li> <li>• To increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply.</li> <li>• To reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions.</li> <li>• To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure.</li> <li>• For local planning authorities to have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</li> </ul>			
DCLG (2011) <i>Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England</i>	Aims to provide support to deliver new homes and improve social mobility.	No targets or indicators	Encourage development of residential properties.	Include sustainability objective that assesses whether housing need is being met.
DEFRA (2011) <i>Securing the Future: Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy</i>	<p>Enable all people throughout the world to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life without compromising the quality of life for future generations. There are 4 shared priorities:</p> <p>sustainable consumption and production;</p> <p>climate change and energy;</p> <p>natural resource protection and environmental enhancement; and</p>	Sets out indicators to give an overview of sustainable development and priority areas in the UK. They include 20 of the UK Framework indicators and a further 48 indicators related to the priority areas.	Seek to meet the aims of the Sustainable Development Strategy.	Include sustainability objectives to cover the shared priorities.



Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	sustainable communities.			
Department of Health (2010) <i>Healthy Lives, Healthy People: our Strategy for public health in England</i>	Protect the population from serious health threats; helping people live longer, healthier and more fulfilling lives; and improving the health of the poorest, fastest. Prioritise public health funding from within the overall NHS budget.	No targets or indicators.	DM policies should reflect the objectives of the strategy where relevant.	Include a sustainability objective relating to health and well-being.
Building Regulations	Set out standards for new built development, in 14 technical parts, which are presented in Approved Documents available on the Planning Portal.  The Code for Sustainable Homes has recently been withdrawn and certain requirements are being incorporated into the Building Regulations.	No targets or indicators.	DM policies should reflect the aims and of and standards set out in the Building Regulations.	Include sustainability objectives relating to high quality design and construction.
DECC (2009) <i>The UK Renewable Energy Strategy</i>	Increase our use of renewable electricity, heat and transport, and help tackle climate change.  Build the UK low-carbon economy, promote energy security and take action against climate change.	15% of energy from renewable sources by 2020.  Reducing UK CO2 emissions by 750 million tonnes by 2030.	Support renewable energy provision including electricity, heat and transport.	Include a sustainability objective relating to increasing energy provided from decentralised community renewable sources.
Community Energy Strategy (DECC, 2014)	Sets out plans to promote and facilitate the planning and development of decentralised community energy initiatives in four main types of energy activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generating energy (electricity or heat)</li> <li>• Reducing energy use (saving energy through energy efficiency and behaviour change)</li> <li>• Managing energy (balancing supply and</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators.	Support community low carbon and renewable energy provision including electricity, heat and transport.	Include a sustainability objective relating to increasing energy provided from decentralised low carbon and renewable sources.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>demand)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purchasing energy (collective purchasing or switching to save money on energy)</li> </ul>			
<p>The Energy Efficiency Opportunity in the UK (DECC, 2012)</p>	<p>This is an Energy Efficiency Strategy aiming to realise the wider energy efficiency potential that is available in the UK economy.</p> <p>The Strategy identifies four barriers to energy efficiency which need to be overcome which include:</p> <p>Embryonic markets.</p> <p>Information.</p> <p>Misaligned financial incentives.</p> <p>Undervaluing energy efficiency.</p> <p>The Strategy draws attention to maximising the potential of existing dwellings by implementing 21st century energy management initiatives on 19th century homes.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Should seek to address the barriers identified within the Strategy and improve the existing building stock through appropriate adaptation measures.</p>	<p>Include SA objectives relating to energy efficiency and adaptation of the existing building stock.</p>
<p>The National Adaptation Programme – Making the Country Resilient to a Changing Climate (Defra, 2013)</p>	<p>The report sets out visions for the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Built Environment – “buildings and places and the people who live and work in them are resilient to a changing climate and extreme weather and organisations in the built environment sector have an increased capacity to address the risks and take the opportunities from climate change”.</li> <li>Infrastructure – “an infrastructure network that is resilient to today’s natural hazards</li> </ul>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Should take account of the visions set out in the Programme.</p>	<p>Include SA objectives which seek to promote the implementation of adaptation measures to make the area more resilient to a changing climate.</p>

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>and prepared for the future changing climate”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Healthy and resilient communities – “a health service, a public health and social care system which are resilient and adapted to a changing climate. Communities and individuals, including the most vulnerable, are better prepared to cope with severe weather events and other impacts of climate change. Emergency services and local resilience capability take account of and are resilient to, a changing climate”.</li> <li>• Agriculture and Forestry – “profitable and productive agriculture and forestry sectors that take the opportunities from climate change, are resilient to its threats and contribute to the resilience of the natural environment by helping maintain ecosystem services and protect and enhance biodiversity”.</li> <li>• Natural Environment – “the natural environment, with diverse and healthy ecosystems, is resilient to climate change, able to accommodate change and valued for the adaptation services it provides”.</li> <li>• Business – “UK businesses are resilient to extreme weather and prepared for future risks and opportunities from climate change”.</li> <li>• Local Government – “Local government plays a central in leading and supporting local places to become more resilient to a range of future risk and to be prepared for the opportunities from a changing climate”.</li> </ul>			

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (Environment Agency, 2011)	<p>This Strategy sets out the national framework for managing the risk of flooding and coastal erosion. It sets out the roles for risk management authorities and communities to help them understand their responsibilities.</p> <p>The strategic aims and objectives of the Strategy are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “manage the risk to people and their property;</li> <li>• Facilitate decision-making and action at the appropriate level – individual, community or local authority, river catchment, coastal cell or national;</li> <li>• Achieve environmental, social and economic benefits, consistent with the principles of sustainable development”.</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators.	Should seek to reduce and manage the risk of all types of flooding.	Include SA objectives which seek to reduce the risk and manage flooding sustainably.
DEFRA (2007) <i>The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland</i>	<p>Make sure that everyone can enjoy a level of ambient air quality in public spaces, which poses no significant risk to health or quality of life.</p> <p>Render polluting emissions harmless.</p>	Sets air quality standards for 13 air pollutants.	Develop policies that comply with the standards.	Include sustainability objectives to protect and improve air quality.
Waste prevention programme for England: Prevention is better than cure – The role of waste prevention in moving to a more resource	The aim of the Programme is to improve the environment and protect human health by supporting a resource efficient economy, reducing the quantity and impact of waste produced whilst promoting sustainable economic growth:	No targets or indicators.	Should take account of the strategic measures in the Programme.	Include SA objectives which seek to promote waste prevention.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
efficient economy (HM Government, 2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>encourage businesses to contribute to a more sustainable economy by building waste reduction into design, offering alternative business models and delivering new and improved products and services;</li> <li>encourage a culture of valuing resources by making it easier for people and businesses to find out how to reduce their waste, to use products for longer, repair broken items, and enable reuse of items by others;</li> <li>help businesses recognise and act upon potential savings through better resource efficiency and preventing waste, to realise opportunities for growth; and</li> <li>support action by central and local government, businesses and civil society to capitalise on these opportunities.</li> </ul>			
Future Water: The Government's Water Strategy for England (DEFRA, 2008)	<p>Sets out how the Government want the water sector to look by 2030 and an outline of the steps which need to be taken to get there.</p> <p>The vision for 2030 is one where we, as a country have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“improved the quality of our water environment and the ecology it supports, and continue to maintain high standards of drinking water quality from taps;</li> <li>Sustainably managed risks from flooding and coastal erosion, with greater understanding and more effective management of surface water;</li> <li>Ensure a sustainable use of water resources, and implement fair, affordable</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators.	Should aim to contribute to the vision set out in this Strategy.	Include SA objectives which seek to protect, manage and enhance the water environment.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>and cost-reflective water charges;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cut greenhouse gas emissions; and</li> <li>• Embed continuous adaptation to climate change and other pressures across the water industry and water users”.</li> </ul>			
<p>Water for People and the Environment: Water Resources Strategy for England and Wales (Environment Agency, 2009)</p>	<p>The Strategy vision for water resource “is for there to be enough water for people and the environment, meeting legitimate needs”.</p> <p>Its aims include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To manage water resource and protect the water environment from climate change.</li> <li>• Restore, protect, improve and value species and habitats that depend on water.</li> <li>• To contribute to sustainable development through good water management.</li> </ul> <p>People to understand how water and the water environment contribute to their quality of life.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Should reflect the aims of the strategy where relevant.</p>	<p>Include SA objective which seeks to promote water management and efficiency.</p>
<p>Safeguarding our Soils: A Strategy for England (DEFRA, 2009)</p>	<p>The vision is “by 2030, all England’s soils will be managed sustainability and degradation threats tackled successfully. This will improve the quality of England’s soils and safeguard their ability to provide essential services for future generations”.</p> <p>The Strategy highlights the areas for priority including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better protection for agricultural soils.</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing stores of soil carbon.</li> <li>• Building the resilience of soils to a changing climate.</li> <li>• Preventing soil pollution.</li> <li>• Effective soil protection during</li> </ul>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Should help protect and enhance the quality of soils and seek to sustainably manage their quality for future generations.</p>	<p>Include SA objective which seeks to safeguard and enhance the quality of soil and encourage development on brownfield land.</p>

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>construction and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dealing with our legacy of contaminated land.</li> </ul>			
<p>DEFRA (2011) <i>Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services</i></p>	<p>The strategy aims to guide conservation efforts in England up to 2020, and move from a net biodiversity loss to gain. The strategy includes 22 priorities which include actions for the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agriculture;</li> <li>• Forestry;</li> <li>• Planning and Development;</li> <li>• Water Management;</li> <li>• Marine Management;</li> <li>• Fisheries;</li> <li>• Air Pollution; and</li> </ul> <p>Invasive Non-Native Species.</p>	<p>The strategy develops ambitious yet achievable goals for 2020 and 2050, based on Aichi Targets set at the Nagoya UN Biodiversity Summit in October 2010.</p>	<p>Develop policies that promote conservation and enhancements of biodiversity.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objective that relates to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity.</p>
<p>DfT (2013) <i>Door to Door: A strategy for improving sustainable transport integration</i></p>	<p>The strategy's vision is for an inclusive, integrated and innovative transport system that works for everyone, and where making door-to-door journeys by sustainable means is an attractive and convenient option. Four key areas to address are highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improving availability of information;</li> <li>• simplifying ticketing;</li> <li>• making connections between different steps in the journey, and different modes of transport, easier; and</li> </ul> <p>providing better interchange facilities.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Enhance public transport provision and encourage active modes of travel such as walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Include a relevant sustainability objective relating to sustainable transport.</p>
<p><b>Legislation</b></p>				

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
Housing Act 2004	<p>Protect the most vulnerable in society and help create a fairer and better housing market.</p> <p>Strengthen the Government's drive to meet its 2010 decent homes target.</p>	No indicators or targets.	Allocate sites and develop policies that help to create a fairer and better housing market.	Include sustainability objectives aiming to improve access to good quality and affordable housing.
<b>LOCAL</b>				
Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull Local Biodiversity Action Plans (2012-2015)	<p>Outlines how landowners, land-managers and policy makers will protect the characteristic wildlife and landscapes of our sub-region. It contains 26 Species Action Plans for threatened plants and animals, and 24 Habitat Action Plans covering farmland, woodlands, wetlands, grasslands, urban areas and post-industrial land.</p>	There are a number of targets contained within each Species and Habitat Action Plan.	Seek to avoid conflict with the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in the Borough.	Include SA objectives that relate to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity.
North Warwickshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2009-2026	<p>The 2026 vision for North Warwickshire:</p> <p><i>"Rural North Warwickshire; a community of communities. A place where people want to live, work and visit, now and in the future, which meets the diverse needs of existing and future residents, is sensitive to the local environment, and contributes to a high quality of life. A place which is safe and inclusive, well planned, built and run, and offers equality of opportunity and good services for all"</i></p> <p>Three key priorities for improving the overall quality of life in North Warwickshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raising aspirations, educational attainment and skills</li> <li>• Developing healthier communities</li> </ul>	No targets or indicators	Ensure that the DM policies comply with the three key priorities for North Warwickshire.	Include SA objectives that relate to education and skills, health, and access to services.



Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving access to services</li> </ul>			
North Warwickshire Corporate Plan 2012-13	<p>Vision:</p> <p><i>"North Warwickshire, a place where people want to live, work, invest and visit. A Council that, despite tough times, maintains its front line services and works to improve the health and well-being and economic environment of its communities".</i></p> <p>Ten priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public services and council tax</li> <li>Local employment</li> <li>Environment</li> <li>Recycling</li> <li>Crime and disorder</li> <li>Countryside and heritage</li> <li>Housing</li> <li>Access to services</li> <li>Consultation and communication</li> <li>Health and well-being</li> </ul>	General targets set under each priority.	Ensure that the DM policies comply with the ten priorities set out in the corporate plan	Include SA objectives that relate to a range of sustainability issues and seek to improve the overall quality of North Warwickshire's natural and built environment and improve quality of life for its residents.
North Warwickshire Core Strategy (adopted October 2014)	<p>Sets out the strategic planning policies that the Borough Council and its partners will pursue over the next 20 years</p> <p>Identifies 9 Strategic Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To secure a sustainable pattern of development reflecting the rural character of the Borough</li> <li>To provide for the housing needs of the Borough</li> <li>To develop and grow the local economy for the benefit of local residents</li> <li>To maintain and improve the vitality of the Market Towns</li> </ul>	<p>Between 2011 and 2029 at least 3,650 dwellings will be developed.</p> <p>Between 2011 and 2029 at least 60 hectares of local employment land will be provided.</p>	Ensure that the Local policies help deliver the housing and employment land targets set out in the Core Strategy, ensuring that development is high quality.	North Warwickshire's Core Strategy has been subject to SA using similar SA objectives to those that are being used during the SA of the Local Plan.

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To promote rural diversification</li> <li>To deliver high quality developments based on sustainable and inclusive designs</li> <li>To protect and enhance the quality of the natural and historic environment across the borough</li> <li>To establish and maintain a network of accessible good quality green infrastructure, open spaces, sports and recreational facilities</li> <li>To ensure the satisfactory provision of social and cultural facilities</li> </ul>			
<p>North Warwickshire Framework for Sustainable Rural Action and Delivery Plan</p>	<p>Equality, diversity and choice for all who live and work in rural North Warwickshire.</p> <p>The Delivery Plan for the Framework includes a number of aims:</p> <p>Aim A: Thriving, vibrant and sustainable rural communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A1: To ensure that communities have fair and equal access to a wide range of services</li> <li>A2: To encourage communities to see themselves as continually changing, with a mix of age, social class, income and ethnic background: to have a positive view of their future and to feel a sense of pride and belonging.</li> </ul> <p>Aim B: A diverse and dynamic rural economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B1: North Warwickshire will be a place where business will want to invest, to succeed and remain</li> <li>B2: Local people will benefit from a</li> </ul>	<p>The Delivery Plan includes a number of 'aspirations' through which the aims will be achieved.</p>	<p>Develop policies that help achieve the aims identified in the Framework and Delivery Plan and support rural communities in North Warwickshire.</p>	<p>Include SA objectives that relate to enhancing rural communities and the rural economy.</p>

Strategy / Plan / Programme	Key objectives relevant to Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>successful rural economy</p> <p>Aim C: An Attractive, varied and productive local environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C1: To conserve and enhance the local environment</li> <li>• C2: To promote and develop local environmental sustainability</li> </ul>			

# Appendix 2

## Baseline Information

Baseline information provides the context for assessing the sustainability of the policy options for the Local Plan and it provides the basis for identifying trends, predicting the likely effects of the Plan and monitoring its outcomes. The requirements for baseline data vary widely, but it must be relevant to environmental, social and economic issues, be sensitive to change and should ideally relate to records which are sufficient to identify trends.

Annex 1(f) of the SEA Directive requires data to be gathered on biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors. As an integrated SA and SEA is being carried out, baseline information relating to other 'sustainability' topics has also been included; for example information about housing, social inclusiveness, settlement liveability, transport, energy, waste and economic growth.

The baseline information for North Warwickshire was originally compiled by NWBC and was presented in the SA scoping report for the LDF in 2006. It has been updated several times during the production of the SA reports for the Core Strategy and the emerging Site Allocations Plan, and has now been updated again and refined to relate specifically to the SA of the Local Plan.

## Population

At the time of the 2011 Census, there were 62,014 people living in North Warwickshire<sup>2</sup>. The Borough is relatively sparsely populated with 2.2 persons per hectare compared to 2.8 persons per hectare in Warwickshire as a whole and 4.1 persons per hectare in England.

## Housing

NWBC has used its Strategic Housing Market Assessment<sup>3</sup> to provide evidence and information for the Core Strategy (which sets out the housing numbers that the Site Allocations Plan seeks to deliver). North Warwickshire has a relatively high percentage of owner-occupied housing (72.4% compared to 66.7% for Warwickshire and Coventry as a whole). A further 14.4% is social rented and 11.3% privately rented. In terms of dwelling type, there is a relatively high proportion of semi-detached dwellings (39.1%) and proportionately fewer detached and terraced houses (28.3% and 23.5% respectively)<sup>4</sup>.

The average house price in North Warwickshire in the second quarter of 2013 was £163,289 compared to £251,533 for Warwickshire as a whole and £246,764 for England<sup>5</sup>. House prices vary significantly between wards, with Fillongley and Curdworth having the highest average prices in the Borough and Atherstone Central having amongst the lowest.

In the year 2010/11, 105 net dwellings were constructed and 88 were completed during 2011/12<sup>6</sup>. Affordable housing need is not as high in the Borough as elsewhere in Coventry and Warwickshire; however there is still an identified need of 112 units per annum<sup>7</sup>. The provision of affordable housing remains one of the main priorities for the future<sup>8</sup>. The 'right to buy'/acquire policy has exacerbated the local shortage of affordable housing, leaving a dwindling supply of housing held by the Council or Registered Social Landlords.

Throughout the Borough and especially in the smaller communities there is a particular need for younger person's accommodation and elderly person's accommodation.<sup>9</sup>

There is currently one socially rented gypsy and traveller site in the Borough and a number of privately run sites<sup>10</sup>. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) from 2013

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/census/2011-census/key-statistics-for-local-authorities-in-england-and-wales/stb-2011-census-key-statistics-for-england-and-wales.html>

<sup>3</sup> *Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (November 2013)*.

<sup>4</sup> *Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (November 2013)*.

<sup>5</sup> *DCLG Live Tables, Table 581 Mean house prices based on Land Registry data* <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-housing-market-and-house-prices>

<sup>6</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2011/2012 (North Warwickshire Borough Council February 2013)*.

<sup>7</sup> *Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (November 2013)*.

<sup>8</sup> *Core Strategy Preface*

<sup>9</sup> *Core Strategy supporting text to NW4 Split of Housing between Settlements*

<sup>10</sup> *Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment: North Warwickshire and Nuneaton and Bedworth Final Report (University of Salford and the University of Birmingham, 2013)*

indicates that there is current authorised provision for an extra 25 residential pitches with a need for another nine residential pitches and five (over the next three years) transit pitches between 2012 and 2028. There was no evidence of any requirement to provide pitches for travelling show people.

The condition of housing stock in the Borough, rated according to the Governments Decent Home Standards, indicated that in 2007, approximately 12% or 2,696 dwellings in the private sector were classed as having a 'category 1' hazard<sup>11</sup> (key hazards assessed include above average risk of fire, damp and excessive cold<sup>12</sup>). There were no dwellings in the public sector assessed as having a 'category 1' hazard.

## Biodiversity

### Habitats

The underlying geology and variations in topography and hydrology contribute to the complex and diverse range of habitats across the Borough<sup>13</sup>. As a whole the Borough is well-wooded, particularly within the upland areas, being most pronounced around Hartshill where extensive woodland blocks and plantations exist. There are also some areas of ancient woodland in the Borough, for example at Bentley Park Wood. In the lower lying river corridors, less woodland exists but other important habitats such as wetland vegetation and grassland are present. There are a number of large wetland areas in the Borough formed from former extraction operations concentrated around the Tame Valley and at Alvecote on the River Anker which provide notable wildlife habitats.

The Local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)<sup>14</sup> identifies six broad habitat groups for which Habitat Action Plans have been prepared. The 25 Habitat Action Plans aim to help conserve and enhance these priority habitats which include grassland, farmland, woodland, urban, post-industrial and wetland habitats. Grendon and Baddesley Common, which is the largest area in Warwickshire of a priority rare habitat of lowland heathland, is located to the east of Baddesley. The Local BAP also contains 27 Species Action Plans for the conservation and protection of priority species including adder, barn owl, farmland birds and water vole.

### Designated Sites

Whilst it has no internationally designated nature conservation sites there are 13 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) located in the Borough covering some 417 ha of land<sup>15</sup>, including the River Blythe SSSI which runs north to south within the western half of the Borough and the Bentley Park Wood SSSI to the south-west of Atherstone. There are also a large number of potential and designated Local Wildlife Sites and four Local Nature Reserves (at Polesworth, Coleshill, New Arley and Kingsbury).

Data indicate that the condition of SSSIs in the Borough is generally improving. In the monitoring year 2008/09 the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)<sup>16</sup> reported that 57% of sites were assessed as 'favourable' and 43% were classed as 'unfavourable'. During 2009/10, the AMR reported that 74% of SSSI sites (309 ha) were assessed as being in a 'favourable' condition with 26% (107 ha) of sites were in an 'unfavourable' condition (of these unfavourable sites 21% are 'actively recovering' and only 4% were recorded as having 'no change or declining'). However, the 2010/11 AMR states that the proportion of SSSIs in favourable condition has decreased to 71% and that the proportion of SSSIs in unfavourable condition has increased to 28%. Nevertheless, the proportion of unfavourable sites that are recovering has increased to 24% and there has been no change in the percentage of sites with no change or declining.

The most recent AMR which considers the condition of these sites<sup>17</sup> identifies that the unfavourable condition of some of these sites is due to localised problems relating to water

---

<sup>11</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

<sup>12</sup> Each hazard is assessed separately, and if judged to be 'serious', with 'high score', is deemed to be a Category 1 hazard.

<sup>13</sup> *North Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessment* (FPCR LLP, 2010)

<sup>14</sup> Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull Biodiversity Action Plan (2006)

<sup>15</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

<sup>16</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2009/10* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2010).

<sup>17</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

pollution and invasive species. Poor water quality is largely due to effluent discharge and agricultural runoff. Development proposals will need to be carefully planned and monitored to ensure that existing problems are not exacerbated and to assist recovery from existing problems e.g. through inclusion of environmental protection measures such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

The Borough also has a number of local nature designations including 46 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) and a number of Local Wildlife Sites.

## Human Health

Life expectancy in North Warwickshire (82 years for females, 79 years for males)<sup>18</sup> is currently slightly lower than the average in England for females but the same for males (83 years for females and 79 years for males)<sup>19</sup>. There has been a considerable increase in the size of the elderly (75-84) and very elderly (85+) age groups since 1992. The 2010 population estimates indicate that the proportion of the population aged over 85 will increase by 200% by 2035<sup>20</sup>.

The Borough has a higher than average level of people classifying themselves as not being in good health.<sup>21</sup> There have been improvements in some areas of health, as the Borough previously recorded above average death rates from heart disease and strokes; however over the last ten years this rate has fallen and is now similar to the average in England<sup>22</sup>.

The latest health priorities in North Warwickshire have been identified in the 2015 Health Profile<sup>23</sup> as mental health, dementia, smoking in pregnancy and improving lifestyle behaviours.

Obesity figures for the Borough show that 19.8% of year six school (age 10-11) pupils are considered obese compared to a County average of 17.4% and an average in England of 19.2%<sup>24</sup>. In 2012, 27.5% of adults within the Borough were classified as obese, which is higher than the English average<sup>25</sup>.

Levels of alcohol related misuse and harm are better than the England average with 506 per 100,000 people in North Warwickshire being admitted to hospital for alcohol related harm in 2012.<sup>26</sup> Fuel poverty<sup>27</sup> in the Borough has been reduced dramatically in recent years, decreasing from 26.3% in 2008 to 15.1% in 2012, resulting in nearly half as many households considered to be 'fuel poor' compared to the two years previously. This figure is the same as the County average of 15.1%.<sup>28</sup>

In terms of access to healthcare facilities, doctors' surgeries are located in many villages as well as the major settlements with 89% of rural residents and 100% of urban residents living within 4km of a GP's surgery compared to a 96% average in England<sup>29</sup>. However, the nearest hospitals are the George Elliot in Nuneaton (which includes A&E facilities) and the Robert Peel in Tamworth (no A&E facilities) both of which are over 5km outside the Borough, resulting in only 72% of residents living within 8 km of a hospital compared to an average of 90% in England<sup>30</sup>.

Physical exercise and access to open spaces are important for maintaining and improving health and there are many opportunities to partake in recreation activities in the Borough (see Vibrant Communities Topic below). There is a good footpath and public rights of way network but

---

<sup>18</sup> North Warwickshire Health Profile 2015. Public Health England.

<sup>19</sup> Reference Table 1: Life expectancy at birth and at age 65 by local areas in England and Wales, 1991-93 to 2011-13 <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Life+Expectancies#tab-data-tables> Accessed 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2015

<sup>20</sup> 2010-based subnational population projections retrieved on 13 June 2012 from:

[http://www.warwickshireobservatory.org/observatory/observatorywcc.nsf/0/6153AE0BA86F30B2802572C00050EBA3/\\$file/2010%20Warwickshire%20briefing%20note.pdf](http://www.warwickshireobservatory.org/observatory/observatorywcc.nsf/0/6153AE0BA86F30B2802572C00050EBA3/$file/2010%20Warwickshire%20briefing%20note.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> North Warwickshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2009-2026 (North Warwickshire Community Partnership, 2009)

<sup>22</sup> North Warwickshire Health Profile 2011. Department of Health

<sup>23</sup> North Warwickshire Health Profile 2015. Public Health England.

<sup>24</sup> Quality of Life in Warwickshire 2013/14.

<sup>25</sup> North Warwickshire Health Profile 2015. Public Health England.

<sup>26</sup> North Warwickshire Health Profile 2015. Public Health England.

<sup>27</sup> A household is said to be in fuel poverty if it needs to spend more than 10% of its income on fuel to maintain a satisfactory heating regime.

<sup>28</sup> Quality of Life in Warwickshire 2014/15.

<sup>29</sup> Quality of Life in Warwickshire 2011/12.

<sup>30</sup> Quality of Life in Warwickshire, 2010.

consultation as part of the Open Space Study highlighted the shortage of cycleways in the Borough<sup>31</sup>.

The health and disability domain of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) covers a number of health issues including life expectancy, comparative illness and disability ratio, and adult mental illness. The Indices of Health Deprivation for North Warwickshire indicate that the north, south and west of the Borough are less deprived, whilst areas of deprivation are found in the east of the Borough around Hurley, Polesworth & Dordon, Atherstone & Mancetter, Hartshill and Old and New Arley.

### *Vibrant Communities*

65% of residents in the Borough report that they feel that they belong to their neighbourhood, while 85% of residents (an average number when compared to the rest of Warwickshire) report they are satisfied with the area as a place to live and 80% perceive that people from different backgrounds get on well together.<sup>32</sup>

Nearly three in 10 residents in North Warwickshire said they had had been actively involved with at least one local community and voluntary organisation in the last 12 months, however this figure decreases by half to 12.2% when more formal volunteering is considered on an average of at least two hours per week over the past year<sup>33</sup>. This is approximately in line with the county average.

### *Crime*

Crime rates have declined between 2006/07 and 2013/14 in North Warwickshire Borough and Warwickshire County as a whole. During 2013/14, the Borough's all recorded crime (48.93 per 1,000 residents) was the third highest in the county but below the county's average rate (51.66 per 1,000 residents). North Warwickshire experiences high rates of domestic burglary, other burglary and vehicle crime<sup>34</sup>.

### *Recreation Opportunities*

In terms of the existing opportunities to partake in recreation in the Borough, the Open Space, Sport and Recreation study<sup>35</sup> identified that generally there is a wide appreciation of countryside and environmental recreation facilities. However, a number of issues were identified including:

- Dissatisfaction with the quantity and quality of sports pitches and ancillary facilities (in particular for football).
- An uneven spread of facilities across the Borough.
- A need for improved provision for children and young people, in particular for the older age range.
- Problems of accessing facilities and opportunities from rural areas.
- Problems faced in accessing facilities and opportunities for people with disabilities and limited mobility.

There are established trails for walkers around a number of towns and villages such as the North Arden Heritage Trail (a 25 mile circular walk), as well as a good public rights of way network. The Northern Warwickshire Cycleway covers approximately 35 miles around the Borough, with more localised routes in Atherstone, Polesworth, Coleshill and Kingsbury. However, consultation as part of the Open Space Study highlighted a shortage of cycleways.

### **Economy, Employment and Skills**

Following the demise of the mining industry, and the closure of all but one of the coal mines, many of the historic small-scale mining settlements in the Borough have struggled economically.

---

<sup>31</sup> Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study for North Warwickshire Borough (January, 2008).

<sup>32</sup> North Warwickshire *Place Survey 2008*.

<sup>33</sup> Living in Warwickshire Survey, 2013

<sup>34</sup> *Quality of Life in Warwickshire, 2014/15*

<sup>35</sup> *Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study for North Warwickshire Borough* (January, 2008).



Other settlements have sought to diversify their economic base, for example by attracting small-scale industrial parks to former mining sites.

The Borough has seen an increase in employment land, particularly logistics, but a decrease in manufacturing<sup>36</sup>. This is reflected in the employment profile in the Borough, with 25% of jobs in the transport and communications sector (compared to a regional and national average of under 6%) followed by the distribution, hotel and restaurant sector (20%)<sup>37</sup>. Large brownfield sites, such as Hams Hall, Birch Coppice, and Kingsbury Link, have been used for development, mainly B8 (storage and distribution) uses and Hams Hall and Birch Coppice also benefit from intermodal rail freight interchanges. The Borough is the location for many national and international companies including Aldi, TNT, BHS, 3M, BMW, Sainsbury, Subaru and Ocado.

There are a number of other, older industrial estates in Atherstone, Mancetter, Arley and Coleshill that serve the local and sub-regional employment needs of the Borough with mostly smaller companies (over 90% of companies in the Borough employ 10 or less employees<sup>38</sup>). However, a large proportion of the Borough's workforce (over 50%) commutes to urban areas outside the Borough such as Birmingham and Tamworth<sup>39</sup>.

A study of employment land in 2007<sup>40</sup> indicated that historically the Borough has had an over-supply of employment land, with availability at that time meeting needs until 2011. However, the study also highlighted concern with the limited provision of land for offices (B1 use). A total of 19.9 hectares of additional employment floor space was completed during 2010 – 1.3 hectares of this was employment use B1/B2 combined and 18.6 hectares was employment use B8. 1.1 hectares of the 19.9 hectares completed was on previously developed land<sup>41</sup>. A more recent employment land study<sup>42</sup> recommends that the Council makes provision for the delivery of 70 hectares of employment land over the period from 2006 to 2028 in order to support local employment growth as follows:

- Office/R&D: 15ha
- Industrial: 15ha
- Warehouse/Distribution: 40ha

78.6% of residents in the Borough are of working age (16-64), which is slightly above the regional and national averages. The unemployment rate within North Warwickshire Borough is low (3.6%) relative to the regional (5.8%) and the Great Britain averages (5.2%)<sup>43</sup>. This unemployment rate for the Borough represents an increase on earlier periods, probably reflecting the recent economic downturn.

During 2015, North Warwickshire Borough had a low Job-Seekers Allowance (JSA) claimant rate at 0.7%<sup>44</sup>, which is 1.1% lower than the regional average and 0.8% below the national rate<sup>45</sup>.

The Indices of Employment Deprivation for North Warwickshire show areas of high and low employment and indicate that the south, west and very north of the Borough is relatively less deprived, whilst some areas of deprivation are found in the east of the Borough around Atherstone/ Mancetter, Polesworth, Hartshill, Ansley, New Arley and Old Arley. Hurley in the centre of the Borough is also relatively deprived.

### *Education and Skills*

There are secondary schools in the Borough at Kingsbury, Polesworth, Atherstone and Coleshill, which are linked to a good network of primary schools (there are 32 primary schools in the

---

<sup>36</sup> Core Strategy Spatial Portrait text.

<sup>37</sup> Employee Jobs (2008) Nomis: <http://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/2038431960/report.aspx#tabempocc>

<sup>38</sup> Core Strategy Spatial Portrait text.

<sup>39</sup> Core Strategy Spatial Portrait text.

<sup>40</sup> Coventry, Solihull & Warwickshire Sub Region Employment Land Study, June 2007.

<sup>41</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

<sup>42</sup> Employment Land Review Update (Outside Consultants, 2013).

<sup>43</sup> Labour Market Profile: North Warwickshire Jan 2015 – Dec 2015. Nomis: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157181/report.aspx#tabempunemp>

<sup>44</sup> [Quality of Life](#) in Warwickshire Report (Warwickshire Observatory, 2013).

<sup>45</sup> Labour Market Profile: North Warwickshire November 2015. Nomis: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157181/report.aspx#tabempunemp>

Borough<sup>46</sup>). Further Education opportunities are available in Nuneaton, both at King Edward College and North Warwickshire & Hinckley College. Beyond the County boundary, Staffordshire County Council offers coach travel to Warwickshire residents in order to access Tamworth College<sup>47</sup>.

In spite of an increase of KS4 Achievement for 5 or more A\*-C grades at GCSEs (including English and Maths) from 2009, in 2013 North Warwickshire experienced the lowest levels (18%) compared to most of the County as a whole (33%)<sup>48</sup>. Evidence<sup>49</sup> shows that pupils in secondary schools in North Warwickshire perform just slightly above those in the rest of the West Midlands but perform less well nationally, with only 69.6% of pupils in 2015 obtaining Level 2 qualifications compared to an average across the region of 67.9% and England of 73.6%.<sup>50</sup> The Sustainable Community Strategy identified problems with:

- Low levels, or lack, of formal qualifications.
- Fewer young people gaining five or more A\* - C GCSE grades (including English and Maths).
- The number of young people aged 16-18 not in education, employment or training (NEETs) – North Warwickshire has the highest rate of 16-18 'NEET Rates' in the County at 7.5% (Warwickshire has a total of 5%). The current national Government target is 4.4%<sup>51</sup>.
- Low levels of aspiration and expectation.

The Indices of Education, Skills and Training Deprivation for North Warwickshire indicate that much of the south and west of the Borough is relatively less deprived, except for areas to the north and west of Coleshill. Areas of deprivation are found in the east of the Borough around Hurley, Piccadilly, Woodend, Polesworth/Dordon, Warton, Shuttington, Atherstone/Mancetter, Hartshill, Ansley, Old Arley and New Arley.

### Geology and Soils

Agricultural land is found throughout the Borough. Land graded as 1 or 2 (the highest grading under the Agricultural Land Classification) is predominately located in the undeveloped central parts of the Borough with some pockets to the north.

Non-agricultural land includes the main urban areas and areas of extant and previously worked mineral deposits. Mineral deposits in the Borough include sand and gravel to the west and north-east and exposed coalfield (predominantly a band running north to south from Shuttington through Polesworth/Dordon, as far as Ansley).

There are 24 Local Geological I Sites (LoGS) designations in the Borough<sup>52</sup>, including in a band running from Hartshill to Bentley and several north of Polesworth. Of the 13 SSSIs in the Borough, four (Boon's Quarry, Illing's trenches, Kingsbury Brickworks and Woodlands Quarry) are designated for their geological and geomorphological features. There are also a number of Mineral Consultation Areas and Minerals Safeguarding Areas in the Borough.

In relation to contaminated land within the Borough, the Core Strategy<sup>53</sup> notes that the raw material, heavy infrastructure and disposal needs of the adjacent Birmingham conurbation and other nearby major urban areas have resulted in potential contamination in addition to the legacy from extensive coal mining and other extraction in the Borough.

---

<sup>46</sup> <http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/schools>

<sup>47</sup> *Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026* (Warwickshire County Council)

<sup>48</sup> *Quality of Life in Warwickshire 2014/15*

<sup>49</sup> Labour Market Profile: North Warwickshire Jan 2015 – Dec 2015. Nomis:  
<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157181/report.aspx#tabempunemp>

<sup>50</sup> Labour Market Profile: North Warwickshire Jan 2015 – Dec 2015. Nomis:  
<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157181/report.aspx#tabempunemp>

<sup>51</sup> *NEETS 2011*: <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000938/index.shtml>

<sup>52</sup> <http://wgcg.freehostia.com/LoGS/LoGS-home.html> (Warwickshire Local Geological Sites)

<sup>53</sup> NWBC (2012) Core Strategy Proposed Submission

## *Building Land*

North Warwickshire has a good record of utilising brownfield sites. The Annual Monitoring Report reported<sup>54</sup> 98% of the 130 dwellings completed in North Warwickshire during 2008/09 were on previously developed land. In addition, 82% of these new dwellings were located in the main towns and Local Service Centres which generally provide the most sustainable locations. During 2009/10, 95 dwellings were built, of which 98% were on previously developed land and 96% were within urban areas. All new employment sites were on previously developed land. The AMR for 2010/2011 records 105 gross dwellings completed, of which 99% were on previously developed land and 76% in urban areas. All completed employment floor space was on previously developed land<sup>55</sup>.

In 2010/11<sup>56</sup> 69% of new dwellings completed were built at densities over 30 dwellings per hectare, a decrease of 16 percentage points compared to the 2009/10 figures.<sup>57</sup> Most sites developed at a density of less than 30 dwellings per ha reflect consents granted prior to the introduction of the core indicator and/or reflect both the rural nature of the Borough and character of sites within the Borough's Conservation Areas<sup>58</sup>.

Historically, North Warwickshire has had a number of large brownfield sites that have been redeveloped, leading to an over-supply of employment land in relation to the old Warwickshire Structure Plan 2006-2011. Two of the largest sites, Hams Hall and Birch Coppice, were identified as regional logistics sites in the Regional Plan. There are also brownfield and derelict sites available within many of the settlement development boundaries with potential for re-development.

## **Water**

### *Water Supply and Waste Water Treatment*

The public water supply in Warwickshire is provided by Severn Trent Water. In terms of water availability, the overwhelming majority of the resources in this area are classed as "No Water Available" and are forecast to remain so to 2018<sup>59</sup>. This leaves no water available for further licensing at low flows and places restrictions on abstraction during high flows.

The Environment Agency's assessment of the relative water stress throughout England indicates that water resources in the North Warwickshire area are under moderate stress, with some surrounding areas under serious stress<sup>60</sup>. It is also predicted that the effects of climate change could further reduce supply and increase demand.

In terms of waste water treatment capacity in the Borough, findings from the water cycle study<sup>61</sup> found that there is no hydraulic capacity at Atherstone waste water treatment works (WWTW) to accommodate growth. The phasing of development in Atherstone/Mancetter will be influenced by the timing of infrastructure provision. The study also found that there is likely to be sufficient capacity at Polesworth and Coleshill WWTWs to accommodate the proposed level of growth<sup>62,63</sup>.

### *Water Quality*

The majority of North Warwickshire Borough is located within the Tame, Anker and Mease River Basin District (RBD) although a small area in the south east of the Borough is located within the Warwickshire Avon RBD. Within the Tame, Anker and Mease RBD, currently only 3% of water bodies are achieving 'good' ecological status and this figure is expected to remain the same up to 2015<sup>64</sup>. Evidence suggests that the key reasons for water bodies failing to achieve 'good' status are point source discharges from water industry sewage works, run-off from urban areas and by

---

<sup>54</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2009/10* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2010).

<sup>55</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

<sup>56</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

<sup>57</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2009/10* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2010).

<sup>58</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11* (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).

<sup>59</sup> *Warwickshire sub-regional Water Cycle Study North Warwickshire Borough Council Final Report* (Halcrow, March 2010)

<sup>60</sup> Areas of Water Stress, Final Classification; Environment Agency.

<sup>61</sup> *Warwickshire sub-regional Water Cycle Study North Warwickshire Borough Council Final Report* (Halcrow, March 2010)

<sup>62</sup> *Warwickshire sub-regional Water Cycle Study North Warwickshire Borough Council Final Report* (Halcrow, March 2010)

<sup>63</sup> Based on 3,000 new homes in North Warwickshire Borough as set out in the West Midlands RSS phase 2 revision document.

<sup>64</sup> *Warwickshire sub-regional Water Cycle Study North Warwickshire Borough Council Final Report* (Halcrow, March 2010)

physical modifications to watercourses<sup>65</sup>. 75% of rivers within this RBD have a good chemical status<sup>66</sup>.

### *Flood Risk*

The Borough is crossed by eight Main Rivers: The River Anker, River Tame, River Cole, River Blythe, River Bourne, Bramcote Brook, Coleshill Hall Brook and Hollywell Brook.

Flood risk is widespread throughout the Borough – areas of flood risk include a band just north of the A5 corridor along the Coventry Canal and to the west along the Rivers Blythe and Tame. This acts as a constraint on development around Polesworth/Dordon and Atherstone/Mancetter, as well as the settlements to the west.

Historically, significant flood events in the Borough have been associated with surface water and fluvial flooding. For example, in 1992 flooding significantly affected the Rivers Anker, Blythe and Tame, along their entire length through the north-east and west of the Borough respectively.

The presence of formal flood defences across North Warwickshire is minimal and is concentrated in the Coleshill Area where the River Tame, Cole, Blythe and Bourne converge<sup>67</sup>. Two major formal flood defences in the Borough are the Marsh Lane Embankment (providing protection along the River Tame for Water Orton) and a raised flood embankment at Whitacre Heath<sup>68</sup>. There are no flood storage areas within the Borough. The Environment Agency has identified a number of locations where flood alleviation works may provide benefits to local communities. This includes surface water flood alleviation schemes at Polesworth.

According to the AMR<sup>69</sup> during 2010/11 there were no planning permissions granted in the Borough contrary to advice from the Environment Agency on flooding and water quality grounds.

### *Air Quality*

The most significant source of air pollution in North Warwickshire is from transport, reflecting the above average levels of private vehicle use associated with more rural areas, along with higher levels of through-traffic due to the significant number of motorway and trunk roads<sup>70</sup>.

Until recently there was one Area Quality Management Area (AQMA) in the Borough, declared for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) at Coleshill (Stonebridge) adjacent to Junction 4 of the M6 bounded by Stonebridge Road. The AQMA was declared in March 2001, and related to one residential property adjacent to Junction 4 of the M6 where it intersects with the A446 and the M42<sup>71</sup>.

There have been no new objective level exceedences in recent years in North Warwickshire. Indeed, there has also been a continued reduction in annual mean levels of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) at an affected farmhouse in the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) below the objective level. The farmhouse has also been vacant since 2008 and has fallen into a state of disrepair, and is likely to be used for other non-habitable purposes in the future. During the previous round of assessment in North Warwickshire it was proposed to revoke the AQMA as it no longer exceeds the objective level for NO<sub>2</sub>. This was agreed by Defra and the AQMA was formally revoked by North Warwickshire Borough Council from 1st February 2013.<sup>72</sup>

### *Climatic Factors*

#### *Energy Use and CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions*

In 2007, North Warwickshire's total energy consumption was just over 4,000 GWh/year, with transport being the largest consumer of energy in the Borough followed by thermal and electricity respectively<sup>73</sup>. The Borough displays a similar energy consumption profile to the rest of Warwickshire.

---

<sup>65</sup> Warwickshire sub-regional Water Cycle Study North Warwickshire Borough Council Final Report (Halcrow, March 2010)

<sup>66</sup> Warwickshire sub-regional Water Cycle Study North Warwickshire Borough Council Final Report (Halcrow, March 2010)

<sup>67</sup> URS (2013) Stratford-on-Avon DC, Warwickshire CC, North Warwickshire BC & Rugby BC Level 1 SFRA Report

<sup>68</sup> URS (2013) Stratford-on-Avon DC, Warwickshire CC, North Warwickshire BC & Rugby BC Level 1 SFRA Report

<sup>69</sup> Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11 (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2010).

<sup>70</sup> Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2016 (Warwickshire County Council 2011)

<sup>71</sup> Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2016 (Warwickshire County Council 2011)

<sup>72</sup> Quality of Life in Warwickshire Report (Warwickshire Observatory, 2013).

<sup>73</sup> Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).

Total annual emissions for North Warwickshire in 2007 were just over 1,000 ktCO<sub>2</sub>/year<sup>74</sup>. This figure is comparable to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in a number of other authorities in Warwickshire. North Warwickshire is, however, the largest emitter of CO<sub>2</sub> with regards to road transport due to both the high levels of private car use and the number of motorways and trunk roads running through the Borough. Per capita emissions in the Borough (2.39 tCO<sub>2</sub>) are slightly higher than the regional average (2.28 tCO<sub>2</sub>)<sup>75</sup>.

In terms of the CO<sub>2</sub> arising from energy type in the commercial and industrial sector in the Borough, the biggest proportion of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is from electricity (63%) followed by gas (22%), oil (13%) and coal (3%). For dwellings, gas is the largest emitter (51%) followed by electricity (44%) oil (4.2%) and coal (1%).

### *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation*

North Warwickshire currently has 113 GWh of installed low/zero carbon energy generation capacity which is the highest level of capacity from renewable sources of any district in Warwickshire<sup>76</sup>. This capacity represents 2.6% of North Warwickshire's total energy consumption (7.1% excluding energy used for transport)<sup>77</sup>. Landfill gas dominates current installed low/zero carbon capacity in the Borough, followed by Gas Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and small scale wind (below 500 Kw in capacity).

Potential future renewable and low carbon energy production in the Borough has been assessed in the regional Renewable Energy Capacity Study<sup>78</sup> and in sub-regional Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study<sup>79</sup>. The regional study indicates that that North Warwickshire has considerable potential for renewable energy generation from wind (915 MW potential capacity of commercial wind farm development and 66 MW for small scale wind) although this is based on potential rather than what is actually deployable on the ground. However, it also indicated that there are constraints on the potential for wind energy in certain locations due to factors such as the limited wind speeds and the impact on and proximity to adjoining development. There are also constraints on wind turbine infrastructure in the vicinity of Birmingham Airport where consultations are required on all structures of 90m or more<sup>80</sup>.

The sub regional study draws on the Regional study but provides more detail to enable local authorities to set targets for their Core Strategies. It suggests that by 2026 North Warwickshire might accommodate 9-18 wind turbines, meeting 9-18% of electricity demand<sup>81</sup> but that there is little opportunity for further large scale wind generation due to a number of constraints such as low wind speeds and proximity to buildings from suitable sites. A biomass heating scheme with a capacity of 8,500 MWh is also likely to be developed in the Borough<sup>82</sup>. The study also highlights the potential in North Warwickshire for incorporating low and zero carbon micro-generation technology into new build development and retrofitting existing built development in order to meet renewable energy targets. Under base case assumptions, the study estimates that by 2025/6 the Borough could meet 13% of its heat energy needs and 15% of its electrical energy needs from renewable sources.

## **Material Assets and Resources**

### *Waste*

Warwickshire County Council is the minerals and waste authority responsible for the depositing, recycling and management of waste in the Borough, while NWBC is responsible for the collection of municipal waste. NWBC currently has a fortnightly collection of recyclables (paper, textiles,

---

<sup>74</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

<sup>75</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

<sup>76</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

<sup>77</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

<sup>78</sup> *Renewable Energy Capacity Study for the West Midlands (SQW et al, March 2011)*

<sup>79</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

<sup>80</sup> CSL (2007) Aerodrome Safeguarding Map

<sup>81</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

<sup>82</sup> *Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Resource Assessment and Feasibility Study (Camco, April 2010).*

cans, glass) and garden waste and residual waste is collected weekly<sup>83</sup>. In 2003/04 there were 35 'bring back' recycling sites and one Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC).

Historically, Warwickshire has relied on landfill as its main form of waste disposal. However, in 2007 the Environment Agency estimated the life expectancy of existing landfill sites in Warwickshire to be only seven years, although it is recognised that it might be possible to identify some additional capacity<sup>84</sup>. Warwickshire is steadily reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill - in 2008/09, 50% of all waste was landfilled which represented a 7% decrease compared to the 2007/08 figure of 57%. In 2009/10, 77,084 tonnes of Warwickshire's biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) was landfilled, which is 36,411 tonnes less than the allocated allowance of 113,495 tonnes of BMW for the year<sup>85</sup>. In 2012/13, 32% of household waste was sent to landfill, 26% was recycled, 26% was composted and 16% was sent to an energy from waste facility<sup>86</sup>.

North Warwickshire Borough has the largest amount of waste by weight collected per head out of all the Warwickshire authorities, and also has the lowest proportion of waste that is recycled or composted<sup>87</sup>. The overall household recycling and composting rate has increased from 48.6% (2011/12) to 52.5% (2012/13). According to 2011/2012 datasets, North Warwickshire has the lowest recycling and composting rate on any Borough in the County, recycling and composting only 34% of its total municipal solid waste compared to Stratford-on-Avon District Council's 60% and a County average of 49%<sup>88</sup>.

A new HWRC at Lower House Farm in North Warwickshire was completed in 2013 next to the recently-expanded Birch Coppice Business Park off the M42/A5 Tamworth junction, replacing the HWRC facility at Grendon and addressing capacity issues at that site. The transfer station on the site will be used to transfer waste arising in North Warwickshire, Tamworth and parts of Nuneaton to a proposed energy from waste plant in South Staffordshire<sup>89</sup>.

## Cultural Heritage

The Borough has significant cultural heritage interest, as described in the Historic Environment Assessment for the Borough<sup>90</sup>. Amongst the more prominent features of the area's historic environment are remains of a number of monastic sites from the middle ages, whilst the economic exploitation of the Borough's geology has left a rich heritage of industrial archaeology<sup>91</sup>. There is no one Borough-wide building style but it is recognised that there are distinctive local styles<sup>92</sup>.

Reflecting the rich historic character of the Borough, there are over 1,350 recognised archaeological sites, of which 29 are designated Scheduled Monuments, with sites around Mancetter and Atherstone and Hartshill.

There are 579 Listed Buildings and 10 Conservation Areas in the Borough. There are also three Registered Parks and Gardens - Packington Hall, Merevale Hall and Arbury Hall.

In 2014, 12 designated assets were identified by English Heritage as being 'at risk', mainly from disuse or neglect<sup>93</sup>. This represents a decrease of four sites from the 2011 Heritage at Risk Register<sup>94</sup> but an increase of two sites since the 2008 Register<sup>95</sup>. Kingsbury Hall (a Grade II\*

---

<sup>83</sup> *Warwickshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy Annual Progress Report- Draft March 2010* (Warwickshire Waste Partnership, February 2010).

<sup>84</sup> *Warwickshire Municipal Waste Management Strategy* (Warwickshire Waste Partnership, October 2007).

<sup>85</sup> Source: <http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/web/corporate/pages.nsf/Links/51C6D89BA42B05B380256A94002C2196>

<sup>86</sup> Warwickshire County Council Waste Statistics, Warwickshire County Council: <https://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/wastestatistics>

<sup>87</sup> *Quality of Life in Warwickshire Report* (Warwickshire Observatory, 2013).

<sup>88</sup> Warwickshire County Council Waste Statistics, Warwickshire County Council: <https://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/wastestatistics>

<sup>89</sup> *Warwickshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy Annual Progress Report- Draft March 2010* (Warwickshire Waste Partnership, February 2010).

<sup>90</sup> Oxford Archaeology (2014) *A Historic Environment Assessment of Potential Development Areas within North Warwickshire*.

<sup>91</sup> Core Strategy text to support Policy NW11

<sup>92</sup> Core Strategy text- So what Makes North Warwickshire Unique?

<sup>93</sup> Heritage at Risk Register 2011 retrieved on 14 April 2014 from: <http://risk.english-heritage.org.uk/register.aspx?rs=1&rt=0&pn=1&st=a&di=North+Warwickshire&ctype=all&crit=>

<sup>94</sup> Heritage at Risk Register 2010 (English Heritage 2010)

<sup>95</sup> Heritage at Risk 2008 (English Heritage, 2008)

Listed Building and Astley Castle (Scheduled Monument) which both feature on the list, are currently undergoing major work<sup>96</sup>.

The settlements receiving the most development are Polesworth, which has a strong historic core, Atherstone, which has a designated historic park and garden to the west and Coleshill, which has a strong historic core with many listed buildings and two conservation areas.

A Historic Environment Assessment<sup>97</sup> for North Warwickshire has been undertaken to inform the selection of sites for development, and considers the sensitivity of different areas in the Borough to development.

## Landscape

Despite its former status as a mining area, North Warwickshire has a varied and undulating landscape. The area is characterised by distinctive and open countryside with market towns and many small villages and hamlets. Large country estates make up part of the Borough and much of the open character is, in part, due to their existence. The overwhelming land use is agriculture, often in extensive estates and accompanied by countryside recreation<sup>98</sup>. The south and west of the Borough is designated as Green Belt.

Baseline landscape conditions have been taken from a number of sources. At a higher level, National Character Area (NCA) descriptions and Countryside Quality Counts (CQC) assessments<sup>99</sup> provide a useful overview of the character and quality of the landscape. Each NCA has specific characteristics and sensitivities which provides the context for the type of development which may be appropriate. The National Character Areas (NCAs) within the Borough include:

- *NCA 97: Arden* (this is the predominant landscape type, covering much of the Borough area). Arden comprises farmland and former wood-pasture lying to the south and east of Birmingham. Within the overall character, there is wide variation which ranges from the enclosed river valleys, through the undulating wooded landscape and small hedged fields of the main plateau, to the remains of the coal industry in the northeast<sup>100</sup>. The CQC assessment found that changes in agriculture and pressure of development continue to transform the character of the area, although woodland character has been strengthened.
- *NCA 69: Trent Valley Washlands*. This NCA applies to the broad Tame Valley that extends south of Tamworth through the western side of North Warwickshire. The Trent Washlands form a distinct, linear, landscape character where the Trent passes through its middle reaches in central England<sup>101</sup>. The CQC assessment suggests that a change in agriculture and settlement pressure is having a profound impact on the character area.
- *NCA 72: Mease/Sence Lowlands*. This NCA covers the north eastern part of the Borough. The Mease/Sence lowlands are the gently rolling agricultural landscapes surrounding the Rivers Mease<sup>102</sup>. CQC evidence suggests that the character of this NCA is broadly being maintained.
- *NCA 67: Cannock Chase and Cank Wood*. This NCA applies to a very small area close to Birmingham, within the North West corner of North Warwickshire and as such many of the characteristics are not directly applicable<sup>103</sup>. However, it is worth noting that the CQC assessment found that changes in agriculture and development pressure continue to transform the area.

More detailed local level information has been taken from the local Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). Stage Two of this work comprised a detailed assessment, focussed on the

---

<sup>96</sup> Core Strategy text to support Policy NW11

<sup>97</sup> Oxford Archaeology (2014) A Historic Environment Assessment of Potential Development areas within North Warwickshire

<sup>98</sup> Core Strategy Policy NW11 Natural and Historic Environment supporting text.

<sup>99</sup> Countryside Quality Counts. Online at: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20101219012433/http://countryside-quality-counts.org.uk/jca/>

<sup>100</sup> Natural England: NCA 97 Arden. Online at: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/areas/default.aspx>

<sup>101</sup> Natural England: NCA 69 Trent Valley Washlands. Online at: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/areas/default.aspx>

<sup>102</sup> Natural England: NCA 72 Mease/Sence Lowlands. Online at: <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/areas/default.aspx>

<sup>103</sup> North Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessment (FPCR LLP, 2010)

main settlements and local service centres (Atherstone / Mancetter, Polesworth / Dordon, Coleshill, Old and New Arley, Grendon / Baddesley Ensor, Hartshill with Ansley Common, Kingsbury and Water Orton) to identify distinct landscape sub units, together with broad descriptions and management prescriptions for each. The landscape sensitivity and capacity for change of each of these areas was assessed. The assessment used a consistent method to evaluate the sub units against a number of criteria, to determine the relative sensitivity of the unit and its capacity for change and/or development in the context of the character of the wider landscape within which the sub unit is situated. The landscape sensitivity for each landscape unit was categorised within the following scale:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <i>Higher landscape sensitivity:</i>   | 4 | Generally with good existing landscape structure and a higher proportion of sensitive landscape features, potential for development not precluded, however there may only be very limited pockets where sensitive development with appropriate mitigation might be feasible |
| <i>Moderate landscape sensitivity:</i> | 5 | Some overall capacity for change with potential for development within pockets of land with appropriate mitigation, but there may be sensitive landscape components and or visual constraints that may limit the scope of development                                       |
| <i>Lower landscape sensitivity:</i>    | 6 | Visually contained and / or degraded landscapes lacking in landscape structure and /or without sensitive landscape components with the most capacity for change and / or development  |

There are 14 landscape units with high sensitivity and 19 landscape units with moderate sensitivity. **Table A2.1** below shows the landscape units with higher sensitivity.

**Table A2.1 Landscape units around main settlements with high sensitivity**<sup>104</sup>

Landscape Unit	Landscape sensitivity
<b>Atherstone &amp; Mancetter</b>	
A: B416 North of Atherstone	Higher
G: Southern Edge of Atherstone	Higher
H: B4111 south of Mancetter	Higher
<b>Polesworth &amp; Dordon</b>	
C: Pooley Hall	Higher
<b>Coleshill</b>	
B: Opposite Coleshill School, east side of Coleshill	Higher
D: Stonebridge Road, A446	Higher
E: A446T	Higher
<b>Old and New Arley</b>	
A: Church Lane, Old Arley (adjacent to school)	Higher
B: Spring Hill, New Arley (South Edge)	Higher
<b>Grendon and Baddesley Ensor</b>	
D: land south of Hill Top, and to the west of Baddesley Ensor.	Higher
E: land to the east of Baddesley Ensor	Higher
<b>Hartshill and Ansley Common</b>	
C: Hartshill – Heys	Higher
E: Hartshill Green	Higher
<b>Kingsbury</b>	
A: Coventry Road, South Kingsbury	Higher

<sup>104</sup> North Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessment (FPCR LLP, 2010)



## Transport

### *Access to services and facilities*

Many of the former mining settlements, particularly to the south of the Borough, are run down, whilst others struggle to support their limited services (often simply a post office and public house). Services are generally limited within the Borough, although exceptions are Atherstone and Coleshill which act as local service centres, typified by their buoyant High Streets. Consequently, many residents travel out of the Borough to access services and facilities.

North Warwickshire has relatively good access to most essential services and facilities, including primary and secondary schools, GPs, food stores and employment centres. However, North Warwickshire Borough does not have a hospital, requiring residents to travel to another district or outside the county<sup>105</sup>. The two nearest hospitals are located three miles outside the Borough and Atherstone Town is the only Major Retail Centre in the Borough<sup>106</sup>. In terms of access to services such as education, North Warwickshire performs at a comparable level to the rest of Warwickshire. Nevertheless, the Annual Monitoring Report<sup>107</sup> (AMR) notes that any reduction in the level and availability of these services and facilities within the Borough, and any reduction in present level of public transport services may have a serious detrimental impact on the accessibility for both new and existing development within the Borough.

A significant proportion of residents commute out of the Borough to work (see the Economy, Employment and Skills topic). Problems accessing open space and recreation facilities have been identified in some areas of the Borough (see the Vibrant Communities topic).

### *Public transport*

Public transport (which includes bus and rail services) is provided across the Borough. Although public transport usage is generally low<sup>108</sup>, exceptions to this include Atherstone which is rail linked (including a service to London Euston) and Coleshill which has a multi-modal station (Coleshill Parkway) providing bus and rail services to various locations outside the Borough. Polesworth has a rail station, although this only provides a single service a day (outbound to Crewe).

The frequency of the public transport services and routes do not meet everyone's needs and there is a perceived lack of information about public transport services<sup>109</sup> making travel by means other than the car difficult in many areas. Consequently, car ownership levels within the Borough remain relatively high at 1.45 cars per household compared to the County average of 1.38 and a national average of 1.16<sup>110</sup>.

Despite the good public transport links in the larger settlements, travel to work is heavily reliant on the use of private car, with this mode accounting for roughly 64.5% of journeys. Only 6.2% of workers in the Borough walk to work and 1.6% cycle to work<sup>111</sup>.

---

<sup>107</sup> *Quality of Life in Warwickshire Report (Warwickshire Observatory, 2013).*

<sup>107</sup> *Annual Monitoring Report 2010/11 (North Warwickshire Borough Council December 2011).*

<sup>108</sup> *Warwickshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 (Warwickshire County Council, 2010)*

<sup>109</sup> *North Warwickshire Sustainable Community Strategy 2009-2026 (North Warwickshire Community Partnership, 2009)*

<sup>110</sup> 2011 Census (Table KS404EW), Office for National Statistics

<sup>111</sup> Source: 2001 Census & 2011 Census (Table CT0015EW), Office for National Statistics

# Appendix 3

## Detailed SA Matrices for the Growth Options

## Options for growth generated within the Borough

- IN1: Development in accordance with the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy.
- IN2: Development in and around the Main Settlements. This option includes Coleshill, the Green Belt Market Town.
- IN3: Focus growth along the A5 corridor.
- IN4: Development around transport hubs.
- IN5: New settlement.

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
1. Equal access to services, facilities and opportunities for all, regardless of income, age, health, disability, culture or ethnic origin.	+/-	++/-	+/-	+/-	++/-	<p><b>Option IN1</b> would involve most new development being focussed at the larger settlements i.e. the Market Towns of Atherstone with Mancetter and Polesworth with Dordon. This would provide more people with relatively easy access to the services and facilities which are concentrated in those areas, and would also stimulate those existing services in terms of potential expansion and ensuring their ongoing viability. However, there is also a risk of existing services in the larger towns being overloaded if adequate new provision is not made and this option would still involve a reasonable amount of development coming forward at smaller settlements in the more rural areas of the Borough, where access to existing services would be less good. While new development in those areas may stimulate the provision of new services, this is less likely if development there is relatively small in scale. Overall, a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN2</b>, the majority of development would take place in the Market Towns, with less in the rural areas compared to option IN1. This approach would have even more positive effects in terms of most people being able to access the existing services and facilities located there and potentially stimulating their ongoing viability or expansion. However, there is an increased risk of those services becoming overloaded if new provision is not made and the potential benefits of stimulating service provision in the rural areas would be even less likely to be achieved. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would involve all development being focussed along the A5 corridor, including at the two non-Green Belt Market Towns in that area (Atherstone and Dordon). Therefore, access to the existing services in those towns would be good and enhancements to services may be stimulated.</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>However, as with options IN1 and IN2, the potential benefits of stimulating service provision in other areas would not be achieved and people in the south of the Borough particularly may be disadvantaged. Existing services in the A5 corridor may also become overloaded if new provision is not made. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN4</b>, development would be focussed around public transport hubs throughout the Borough. While this would provide people (particularly those without a car) with good access to services and facilities in locations around the Borough and further afield, some of the railway stations identified as hubs are on the edge of settlements or are not obviously linked to settlements with a good range of services and facilities. Therefore, opportunities for people to access existing services in close proximity of their homes may be limited. New development in such locations may help to stimulate new provision and address these issues; however this is not yet certain and the relatively small scale of development at each location could make it less likely. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is identified.</p> <p>The provision of a new settlement under <b>Option IN5</b> would involve the provision of new services and facilities alongside housing and other development, which would ensure that residents of the new settlement have good access to services close to their homes and would avoid existing services becoming overloaded. However, opportunities for new development to stimulate the viability and potential expansion of existing services elsewhere would be lost. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p>
2. Developing and supporting vibrant and active communities and voluntary groups, who are able to express their needs and take steps towards meeting them.	+	0	0	+	++	<p>The achievement of this SA objective would be largely affected by factors other than the spatial location of development (i.e. the extent to which facilities such as community centres are provided). However, some of the options could affect the objective as described below.</p> <p><b>Option IN1</b> would involve most new development coming forward at the Market Towns; however the option also provides for some development at the smaller settlements in the more rural areas. This is likely to have a minor positive effect on helping to create and retain vibrant communities in those areas.</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p><b>Option IN2</b> would involve only minimal development coming forward outside of the Market Towns, therefore the same benefits would not be achieved for rural communities and a negligible effect is likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all new development along the A5 corridor, including at the market towns of Atherstone and Dordon. This would again direct development away from the smaller settlements in the rural areas of the Borough, and a negligible effect is likely in terms of stimulating vibrant rural communities.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would involve development being more dispersed around the Borough, focussed around public transport hubs. This could have a positive effect on the creation of vibrant and active communities in rural areas as development wouldn't only be focussed in the larger towns. A minor positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve the development of a new settlement which would be designed as a stand-alone community, with supporting services and facilities alongside housing. This should enable the new settlement to develop as an active and vibrant community, particularly as it would include commercial development so should avoid becoming a dormitory commuter town. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p>
3. Tackling health inequalities and improve health by supporting local communities and by improving access and raising awareness	+/-	++	++/-	++/-	++	<p><b>Option IN1</b> would involve most new development being located at the Market Towns where more people would be able to walk and cycle day-to-day (benefitting health) due to the closer proximity of jobs, services and facilities. In addition, more people would have good access to the healthcare facilities that are concentrated at the Market Towns. However, the option would still involve a reasonable amount of development coming forward at smaller settlements where opportunities to walk and cycle are likely to be limited and access to healthcare facilities less good. Overall, a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN2</b>, the majority of development would take place in the Market Towns, with less in the rural areas compared to IN1. This would have even more positive effects in terms of most people being able to walk and cycle day to day and access healthcare facilities easily. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all development along the A5 corridor, including at</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>the market towns of Atherstone and Dordon. This would have the same positive effects as Options IN1 and IN2 as a reasonable amount of people should be able to make use of active modes of travel day to day and to access the healthcare facilities in those towns. However, this is mixed with a minor negative effect as the focus on the A5 corridor could encourage high levels of car use which could adversely impact health as a result of people leading more sedentary lives as well as increasing air pollution.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would focus development around public transport hubs which may benefit health as a result of reduced air pollution from car use. In addition, people may be more likely to undertake part of their journey on foot or by bicycle, for example to reach a nearby railway station for onward travel. A significant positive effect is therefore likely; however this is mixed with a minor negative effect as access to healthcare services may be poor for some, because some of the transport hubs where development would be focussed are not obviously linked to settlements with a good range of services and facilities.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve developing a new settlement as a relatively self-contained community, incorporating both housing and commercial land as well as supporting services and facilities. This should mean that people are able to live and work in close proximity and therefore undertake more journeys day-to-day on foot or by bicycle, benefitting health. It is assumed that new healthcare facilities would be provided within the new settlement which would ensure residents have easy access and should avoid existing GP surgeries becoming overloaded. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p>
4. Providing decent and affordable housing to meet local needs.	--?	++?/-	--?	++?	-?	<p><b>Option IN1</b> may not provide enough land to deliver the required housing in North Warwickshire - the 2013 SHLAA indicated that there were sites available in accordance with the settlement hierarchy that could accommodate up to 4,966 homes which falls significantly short of the emerging housing target. A potential significant negative effect on this objective is therefore identified, although this is uncertain until the 2016 SHLAA update is complete and the updated housing target is finalised.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> could allow for the provision of enough homes to meet the emerging increased housing target although this is not yet certain; however the option would involve very limited housing provision outside of the Main</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>Settlements and so may not meet the housing needs of smaller communities elsewhere. A mixed (uncertain significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would have a potential significant negative effect on housing delivery, as sufficient sites may not be available to meet identified needs. However, as with Option IN1, this is uncertain until the updated SHLAA is published and the updated housing target is finalised.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> could allow for the provision of enough homes to meet the emerging increased housing target although this is not yet certain, and the option would involve housing provision being more dispersed around the Borough and so is likely to meet the housing needs of smaller communities as well as the Market Towns. A potential but uncertain significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would provide a significant amount of new homes; however other provision will also be required at least in the short term in order to meet the five year housing land supply. A minor negative effect is therefore identified although this is again uncertain until the 2016 SHLAA update is complete.</p>
5. Reducing crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options for the distribution of growth generated within the Borough would affect levels of crime or antisocial behaviour. The effects of new development in any location on this objective will depend on factors such as its design (e.g. the incorporation of lighting) which cannot be determined at this stage. Negligible effects are therefore identified for all five options.
6. Providing opportunities to participate in recreational and cultural activities.	+/-	++/-	+/-	+/-	++	<b>Option IN1</b> would involve most new development being focussed at the larger Market Towns which would provide residents with relatively easy access to the recreational and cultural facilities which are concentrated in those areas. However, this option would still involve a reasonable amount of development coming forward at smaller settlements elsewhere in the Borough, where access to recreational and cultural facilities would be less good. While new development in those areas may stimulate the provision of new facilities, this is less likely if development is relatively small in scale. Overall, a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is likely.

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>Under <b>Option IN2</b>, the majority of development would take place in the Market Towns, with less in the rural areas compared to IN1. This would have even more positive effects in terms of most people being able to access the existing recreational and cultural facilities located there. However, the potential benefits of stimulating provision elsewhere would not be achieved. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would involve all development being focussed along the A5 corridor, including at Atherstone and Dordon. Therefore, access to the existing recreational and cultural facilities in those towns would be good and enhancements to facilities may be stimulated. However, as with option IN2, the potential benefits of stimulating provision in other areas would not be achieved and people in the south of the Borough particularly may be disadvantaged. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN4</b>, development would be focussed around public transport hubs throughout the Borough and while this would provide people (particularly those without a car) with good access to recreational and cultural facilities in other locations around the Borough and further afield, some of the railway stations identified as hubs are on the edge of settlements or are not obviously linked to settlements with a good range of facilities. Therefore, opportunities for people to access existing facilities in close proximity of their homes may be limited. New development in such locations may help to stimulate new provision and address these issues; however this is not yet certain and the relatively small scale of development at each location could make it less likely. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve the development of a relatively self-contained new settlement with supporting infrastructure (assumed to include recreational and cultural facilities) being provided alongside the new housing. As well as providing residents with easy access to facilities in close proximity of their homes, this will avoid existing facilities becoming overloaded. The development could be comprehensively masterplanned to incorporate open space for recreation, and a significant positive effect is likely.</p>



SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
<p>7. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the assets of the natural environment of North Warwickshire, including landscape character.</p>	+/--?	--?	+/-?	--?	--?	<p>All of the effects on this SA objective are currently uncertain as they will depend to some extent on the specific location and design of development sites, which is not yet known for any of the options.</p> <p><b>Option IN1</b> would not involve the removal of land from the Green Belt and so could help to retain open spaces and avoid settlement coalescence, although it is noted that the Green Belt is not necessarily the highest quality landscape in the Borough. Some settlements that have already seen substantial growth would grow even more under this option, which could affect their character and form. While the option would permit some development in the smaller settlements of the Borough where it may be more likely to have prominent landscape impacts, it would be very limited and affordable housing outside of development boundaries will only be permitted where it is small in scale and adjacent to a village. Overall a mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effect is identified although this is uncertain.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would involve development outside of the existing built up area of Coleshill, extending into the Green Belt, which would significantly alter the character of the town and its setting in the wider landscape. The 2010 North Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessment classified three of the five landscape character areas around Coleshill of being of high sensitivity. A potential but uncertain significant negative effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus development along the A5 corridor which is well outside of the Green Belt and so Green Belt land releases would not be required. However, this approach could result in a continuous thread of urban development along the A5 corridor, changing the character of that area. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would focus development at public transport hubs around the Borough. It would require the release of Green Belt land in five areas and a potential significant negative effect is therefore identified. While Green Belt land may not necessarily be the highest quality in terms of its landscape value, releases could change the character and built form of those areas.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> could have significant landscape impacts as the development of an entirely new settlement would be largely if not entirely on greenfield land and could be prominent visually, depending on its location. This option would also probably require the release of land from the Green Belt.</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						However, a site could be selected on the basis of lower landscape impacts. Effects cannot be assessed in detail until the location is known; therefore a potential but uncertain significant negative effect is identified.
8. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment, including the cultural heritage.	--?	--?	--?	--?	-?	<p>All of the effects on this SA objective are currently uncertain as they will depend to some extent on the specific location and design of development sites, which is not yet known for any of the options.</p> <p><b>Option IN1</b> would focus most development in the Market Towns, which could mean that it is more likely to affect the setting of heritage assets such as listed buildings which are more concentrated in those built up areas. However, some development would still come forward in smaller and more rural settlements under this option. It is noted that there are heritage constraints around Atherstone which restrict opportunities for growth there. Overall, a potential but uncertain significant negative effect is identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would focus even more new development in the Main Settlements, and the same potential issues at Atherstone exist; therefore again a potential significant negative effect is identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus most development along the A5 corridor including at Atherstone and Dordon; therefore the same potential issues associated with development at Atherstone exist. A potential significant negative effect is again identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would focus development at public transport hubs throughout the Borough and would therefore be relatively widespread, including some development around Atherstone. A potential significant negative effect is therefore again identified.</p> <p>A new settlement under <b>Option IN5</b> would direct development away from existing built up areas and therefore may be less likely to impact upon the setting of heritage features such as listed buildings. However, there may still be valuable heritage assets in rural areas that would be affected by the new development depending on its location, although it may be possible to select a site based on minimising impacts on heritage assets. A potential minor negative effect is therefore identified.</p>
9. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the biodiversity	-?	-?	-?	-?	+/--?	All of the effects on this SA objective are currently uncertain as they will depend to some extent on the specific location and design of development

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
of North Warwickshire						<p>sites, which is not yet known for any of the options.</p> <p><b>Option IN1</b> would focus most development at the Market Towns, which could mean that it is less likely to affect biodiversity as a result of development on greenfield land in rural areas. However, some development would still come forward in smaller and more rural settlements under this option. It is noted that there are biodiversity constraints around Atherstone which restrict opportunities for growth there. Overall, a potential but uncertain minor negative effect is identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would focus even more new development in the Main Settlements, although the same potential issues at Atherstone exist; therefore again a potential minor negative effect is identified. This option could also result in habitat loss through development on greenfield land around Coleshill in particular.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all development along the A5 corridor including at Atherstone; therefore the same potential issues would exist there. Again, a potential minor negative effect is identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would focus development around the transport hubs throughout the Borough and would therefore be relatively widespread throughout the Borough, including around Atherstone which is constrained in relation to biodiversity features. A potential minor negative effect is therefore again identified.</p> <p>The development of a new settlement under <b>Option IN5</b> is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land, which could impact upon biodiversity depending on the nature and value of the land. However, a new settlement could offer good opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure, in order to reduce habitat fragmentation and mitigate habitat loss from development, and it may be possible to select a site based on minimal impacts on biodiversity features. Therefore, a potentially mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect is identified, although this will depend largely on the location of the new settlement.</p>
10. Ensuring development makes efficient use of previously developed land, buildings and existing	+/-?	++?	+	-/++	--	<p>Under <b>Option IN1</b> most development would be focussed in the Market Towns which could mean that there are more opportunities to redevelop brownfield sites. Development would also be generally well-connected with existing physical infrastructure in the most sustainable locations. However,</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
physical infrastructure in sustainable locations.						<p>the option still allows for a reasonable amount of development in other parts of the Borough i.e. the smaller and more rural settlements where the opposite could be said. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified although this is uncertain depending on the specific location of development sites and whether they are on brownfield land.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would focus even more new development in the larger Market Towns where it would be well-connected with existing infrastructure and opportunities to make use of brownfield land are likely to be good. Development in the smaller settlements would be very limited under this option; therefore a potential significant positive effect is identified although this is again uncertain until the location of specific development sites is known.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all new development along the A5 corridor where there are likely to be reasonable opportunities for reusing brownfield sites, particularly at the towns of Atherstone and Dordon. While this part of the Borough is well-connected in terms of the road network, this does not necessarily make it the most sustainable location. A minor rather than significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN4</b>, development would be focussed at public transport hubs around the Borough. This dispersed development is likely to be on the edge of settlements in many cases and so is not expected to offer good opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites; however the development would be very well connected to existing sustainable transport infrastructure. A mixed (minor negative and significant positive) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN5</b> a new settlement would be developed which it is assumed would be entirely or largely remote from existing physical infrastructure and would require significant new infrastructure development to support it. It is also likely to be mainly if not entirely on greenfield land. A significant negative effect is therefore likely.</p>
11. Maintaining the resources of air, water and productive soil, minimising pollution levels.	+/-	+/--	+/-	+/-	+/--?	<p><b>Option IN1</b> would focus most development at the Market Towns, which each have a railway station with either a good existing service or potential to improve, and where journeys to jobs, services and facilities would be</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>shorter; therefore levels of car use and the associated air pollution should be reduced. However, a reasonable amount of development would still come forward in the more rural areas where levels of car use would be higher. This option would also focus a reasonable amount of development at Coleshill (Category 2 in the settlement hierarchy) where an AQMA has already been declared. Impacts on maintaining productive soils are largely uncertain until specific development sites are known. Although some development would be located in the central and northern parts of the Borough where the highest quality agricultural land is generally found, focussing most development at the Market Towns should minimise impacts on agricultural soil loss. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would focus even more new development in the Main Settlements where levels of car use and the associated emissions would be lower. Development in the smaller settlements would be very limited under this option. However, a significant amount of new development would take place at Coleshill where an AQMA has already been declared. Again, impacts on maintaining productive soils are largely uncertain until specific development sites are known. As with option IN1, although some development would be located in the central and northern parts of the Borough where the highest quality agricultural land is generally found, focussing most development at the Market Towns should minimise impacts on agricultural soil loss. Overall a mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all development along the A5 corridor where road connections are good and therefore levels of car use are more likely to be high – this could have a negative effect on air quality. However, development would be directed away from the existing AQMA at Coleshill. Again, impacts on maintaining productive soils are largely uncertain until specific development sites are known - although some high quality soils are found in the vicinity of the A5 corridor, focussing most development in this built up area should minimise impacts on agricultural soil loss. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would focus development at public transport hubs around the Borough which is likely to encourage the use of non-car based modes of transport, to the benefit of air quality. However, some development is still</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>directed to Coleshill under this option, where an AQMA has already been declared. The dispersed nature of development under this option means that it is difficult to assess the likely impacts on soils until specific development sites are known; however some development is directed to the central and northern parts of the Borough where high quality soils are found and the fact that development would take place outside of the largest towns could increase the likelihood of productive agricultural soils being lost. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve developing a new settlement, which would function as a relatively self-contained town due to the provision of commercial development, services and facilities alongside housing. This should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day and the associated air pollution. However, the development of a new settlement would involve the loss of a large area of greenfield land which could be high quality agricultural soil, depending on the location which is not yet known, although it is noted that the location could be selected to avoid BMV land. Similarly, the proximity of the new settlement to the existing AQMA at Coleshill is not known. A mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effect is therefore likely although there are currently uncertainties.</p>
12. Minimising North Warwickshire's contribution to the causes of climate change whilst implementing a managed response to its unavoidable impacts.	+/-	++/-	-	+	++?	<p>The effects of the five options on this SA objective will depend to some extent on the design of built development rather than its spatial distribution, which is not known at this stage. However, the options will affect this SA objective in terms of the extent to which they will result in car use, and whether they direct development to the areas of the Borough at highest risk from flooding as flood risk is expected to increase as a result of climate change.</p> <p><b>Option IN1</b> would focus most development at the Market Towns, which each have a railway station with either a good existing service or potential to improve. This would enable more people to undertake day to day journeys via rail; therefore reducing car use and the associated greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, journeys to jobs, services and facilities are likely to be generally shorter. However, the option would still involve a reasonable amount of development in the more rural parts of the Borough where levels of car use and the associated emissions would be higher. It is also noted</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>that development at the Market Towns is restricted by the presence of Flood Zone 3. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would focus even more development at the Market Towns where levels of car use and the associated greenhouse gas emissions would be lower. Development in the smaller settlements would be very limited under this option. However, the same issues with regards to flood risk around the Market Towns would apply, and a mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all development along the A5 corridor where road connections are good and therefore levels of car use are more likely to be high – this could have a negative effect on greenhouse gas emissions from transport. A minor negative effect is therefore likely. This is reinforced by the fact that some development would be at Atherstone where there are flood risk constraints, and it is noted that there is an area of high flood risk just to the north of the A5 corridor.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> would focus development at public transport hubs around the Borough which is likely to encourage the use of non-car based modes of transport, to the benefit of transport-related greenhouse gas emissions. A positive effect is therefore likely although this is expected to be minor rather than significant as the dispersed development is also likely to mean that opportunities to walk and cycle day to day are limited. Effects on flood risk are difficult to determine at this stage due to the dispersed nature of development and will depend largely on the specific development sites.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve developing a new settlement, which would function as a relatively self-contained town due to the provision of commercial development, services and facilities alongside housing. This should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day and the associated greenhouse gas emissions. A significant positive effect is therefore likely, although it is uncertain depending on the location of the new settlement in relation to areas of high flood risk in the Borough.</p>
13. Reducing overall energy use through sustainable design,	0	0	0	0	0	None of the five options will have a direct effect on this SA objective, which will be affected by the design of development and the behaviour of

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
increasing energy efficiency and increasing the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources.						residents, rather than the spatial distribution of development.
14. Using natural resources efficiently	0	0	0	0	0	All of the options would result in the same amount of built development and therefore resource consumption. The spatial location of development could affect the sterilisation of minerals resources. Mineral deposits in the Borough include sand and gravel to the west and north-east and exposed coalfield (predominantly a band running north to south from Shuttington through Polesworth/Dordon, as far as Ansley). Minerals Safeguarding Areas for the whole of Warwickshire are identified in the British Geological Survey document, 'Minerals Safeguarding Areas for Warwickshire' (Figure A16). When all types of safeguarding areas are taken into account, the vast majority of the Borough is covered and so it is not possible to identify differences between the options with regards to the sterilisation of resources. Negligible effects are therefore identified for all five options.
15. Increasing use of public transport, cycling and walking and reducing use of the private car.	+/-	++	+/-	++	++	<p>Under <b>Option IN1</b> high numbers of people may be able to walk and cycle day-to-day as most new development would be at the Market Towns where there are more jobs, services and facilities and so journeys may be shorter. People should also be able to make good use of public transport due to links generally being better in the larger towns. However, some growth is still proposed in rural areas under this option, where use of sustainable transport is likely to be more limited. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is identified.</p> <p><b>Option IN2</b> would focus almost all new development in the Main Settlements, where opportunities to use sustainable transport are likely to be good. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would involve focusing all new development along the A5 corridor. This could encourage high levels of car use due to the close proximity of the strategic road network, although it is noted that Polesworth and Atherstone both have railway stations which serve the A5 corridor area. A mixed (minor negative and minor positive) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN4</b> focuses development at public transport hubs around the</p>



SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>Borough, which would ensure that people have good access to the rail and bus network. This could stimulate improvements to the network which could make it more attractive to users, and a significant positive effect is likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve developing a new settlement, which would function as a relatively self-contained town due to the provision of commercial development, services and facilities alongside housing. This should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p>
16. Encouraging and enabling waste minimisation, reuse, recycling and recovery to divert resources away from the waste stream.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the five options will have a direct effect on this SA objective, which will instead be affected by the onsite waste management practices used.
17. Encouraging local sourcing of goods and materials.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options for the distribution of growth will have a direct effect on this SA objective.
18. Creation of a modern, healthy and diverse economy which is able to adapt to changes in the wider economy while remaining relevant to the needs of local people.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options will have a direct effect on this SA objective. While the spatial distribution of development will influence the extent to which people are able to access the jobs that they need, this is addressed under SA objective 19 below. The spatial distribution of development will not affect the health of the local economy as the same amount of employment land would be provided under all five options.
19. Maintaining and enhancing employment opportunities and reducing the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs.	+/-	++/-	+/-	++/-	++/-	<p>The same amount of employment land would be provided under all five options; however the spatial distribution of development will influence how easily most people are able to access jobs.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN1</b> most development would be at the Market Towns where the jobs created would be relatively accessible for most people. The option still allows for some development at smaller settlements where any jobs created may be less accessible, particularly for people without a car; however it would also mean that new jobs are distributed more widely within the Borough instead of being focussed in only a few locations. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is likely.</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
						<p>Under <b>Option IN2</b>, the majority of development would take place in the Market Towns, with less in the rural areas compared to IN1. This would have even more positive effects in terms of most people being able to access jobs; however the new jobs created would be heavily focussed in limited locations and hardly any employment provision would be made in more rural areas to meet the needs of people outside of the Market Towns. Overall a mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN3</b> would focus all development along the A5 corridor. This would mean that people would be well-connected to the road network; however there are capacity issues along that road which could affect the ease at which people can commute to work. It could also encourage road-based transport which would disadvantage non-drivers in terms of accessing jobs although there are railway stations serving the A5 corridor at Atherstone and Polesworth. Development would be focussed in a limited area of the Borough which could mean that access to jobs for people elsewhere (i.e. in the south of the Borough) is poor. Overall a mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option IN4</b>, development would be focused around public transport hubs throughout the Borough which would mean that more people are able to access jobs in other parts of the Borough, including those without a car. Development would be generally more dispersed than under the other options, which could stimulate employment provision in other parts of the Borough than just the Market Towns; however it may also mean that some jobs are coming forward in less accessible areas. An overall mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option IN5</b> would involve the development of a new settlement, with commercial development to be provided alongside housing. This would ensure that jobs are provided for the growing population, in a location that is accessible from the new homes even for people without cars. A significant positive effect is therefore likely. However, this approach would mean that (depending on the location of the new settlement) the new employment land and opportunities may be remote from residents in existing towns and villages, limiting access for them. The significant positive effect is therefore mixed with a minor negative effect.</p>

SA objectives	IN1	IN2	IN3	IN4	IN5	Commentary/justification
20. Ensuring that people of all ages are provided with the opportunity to obtain the skills, knowledge, confidence and understanding to achieve their full potential.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options will have a direct effect on this SA objective. While the spatial distribution of development will influence the extent to which people are able to access jobs and the associated opportunities for work-based training and skills development, this is addressed under SA objective 19 above.

## Options to deal with growth from outside the Borough

- OUT1: Development against the relevant borough, district or city boundary.
- OUT2: Develop in and around the closest settlements.
- OUT3: Add the housing to the overall North Warwickshire Borough figures and distribute according to the preferred option for the whole of the Local Plan.
- OUT4: Development around public transport hubs.
- OUT5: New settlement.

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
1. Equal access to services, facilities and opportunities for all, regardless of income, age, health, disability, culture or ethnic origin.	+/-	++/-	?	+/-	++/-	<p><b>Option OUT1</b> would focus development along the western and southern boundaries of North Warwickshire Borough and therefore within close proximity geographically of the districts that the housing is proposed for. This could mean that people have relatively good access to services there although public transport options are likely to be limited as the new development would be outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the other districts. This would also mean that access to existing services within North Warwickshire could be poor. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the closest settlements in North Warwickshire to the other districts, rather than on the very fringe of North Warwickshire; therefore people would be expected to have better access to existing services within those settlements although it is noted that those services could become overloaded if additional provision is not made. Distances to access services in the other districts would also be slightly longer, although there may be better opportunities to use public transport, benefitting access for those without cars. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>Under <b>Option OUT4</b>, development would be focussed around public transport hubs throughout the Borough. While this would provide people (particularly those without a car) with good access to services and facilities in locations around the Borough and further afield, additional investment would be required and distances to services and facilities in the other districts would be long in some cases. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>The provision of a new settlement under <b>Option OUT5</b> would involve the provision of new services and facilities alongside housing and other development, which would ensure that residents of the new settlement have good access to services close to their homes and would avoid existing services becoming overloaded. However, opportunities for new development to stimulate the viability and potential expansion of existing services elsewhere would be lost and residents may not be functionally linked with services in the other districts, depending on where the new settlement is located. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p>
<p>2. Developing and supporting vibrant and active communities and voluntary groups, who are able to express their needs and take steps towards meeting them.</p>	-	+	+?	+	++	<p>Providing housing for other districts in peripheral areas of North Warwickshire, adjacent to the districts for which the housing is required under <b>Option OUT1</b> could mean that people living and working in those areas do not perceive themselves as part of North Warwickshire but at the same time are not properly integrated within communities in the other districts (the housing provided along the periphery of the district boundaries would in most cases probably be approximately equal distance from communities in North Warwickshire and the other districts although this cannot be determined in more detail until specific development locations are known). A minor negative effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT2</b>, development for adjacent authorities would be integrated within settlements in North Warwickshire so people may perceive themselves more as part of those communities, and a minor positive effect is likely.</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are largely uncertain depending on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan. However, the fact that the additional housing would be integrated within the housing to be provided to meet North Warwickshire's needs should mean that people are more likely to view themselves as part of the Borough, which would have a minor positive effect.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would involve development being more dispersed around the Borough, focussed around public transport hubs. This could have a positive effect on the creation of vibrant and active communities in rural areas as more development would take place there. A minor positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> would involve the development of a new settlement which would be designed as a stand-alone community, with supporting services and facilities alongside housing. This should enable the new settlement to develop as an active and vibrant community, although it is noted that the creation of this community would take considerable time to plan, develop and for community identity to emerge. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p>
3. Tackling health inequalities and improve health by supporting local communities and by improving access and raising awareness	+/-	+/-	?	++/-	+	<p><b>Option OUT1</b> would focus development close to the boundaries of the other districts so people may be able to cycle to work there, although the fact that the development would be outside of the settlements of North Warwickshire and the other districts could mean that levels of car use are high and access to nearby healthcare facilities limited. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would locate development within settlements in North Warwickshire, which could mean that access to healthcare facilities is better but people are less likely to be able to cycle to work in other districts due to the longer distances. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore again identified.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would focus development around public transport hubs which may benefit health as a result of reduced air pollution from car use. In addition, people may be more likely to undertake part of their journey on foot or by bicycle, for example to reach a nearby railway station for onward travel. A significant positive effect is therefore likely; however this is mixed with a minor negative effect as the longer distances from some of the development locations to the other districts could have the opposite effect and increase car use.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> would involve developing a new settlement as a relatively self-contained community, incorporating both housing and commercial land as well as supporting services and facilities. This should mean that some people are able to live and work in close proximity and therefore undertake more journeys day-to-day on foot or by bicycle, benefitting health, although it is expected that a lot of people would still commute to work in the other districts which would have the opposite effect. It is assumed that new healthcare facilities would be provided within the new settlement which would ensure residents have easy access and should avoid existing GP surgeries becoming overloaded. A minor positive effect is therefore likely overall.</p>
4. Providing decent and affordable housing to meet local needs.	++	+	?	-	?	<p><b>Option OUT1</b> would focus the housing required to meet the needs of other districts around the boundary of North Warwickshire Borough, adjacent to the boundary of the district for which the housing is required. This would mean that it is functionally linked to those districts and should more effectively meet their needs. A significant positive effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the nearest settlements in North Warwickshire to the other districts, so it would still be functionally linked (especially as transport links may be slightly better), although it would be slightly further from the other districts. A minor positive effect is therefore likely.</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would distribute development more widely across North Warwickshire and some would therefore be located some distance from the districts that it is being provided for. A minor negative effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT5</b> are also uncertain and would depend on the location of the new settlement in relation to the districts for which housing is being provided and to what extent it would meet their needs by being functionally linked.</p>
5. Reducing crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour.	0	0	0	0	0	<p>None of the options for the distribution of growth generated outside of the Borough would affect levels of crime or antisocial behaviour. The effects of new development in any location on this objective will depend on factors such as its design (e.g. the incorporation of lighting) which cannot be determined at this stage. Negligible effects are therefore identified for all five options.</p>
6. Providing opportunities to participate in recreational and cultural activities.	+/-	++/-	?	+/-	++/-	<p><b>Option OUT1</b> would focus development along the western and southern boundaries of North Warwickshire Borough and therefore within close proximity geographically of the districts that the housing is proposed for. This could mean that people have good access to cultural and recreational facilities there although public transport options are likely to be limited as the new development would be outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the other districts. This would also mean that access to existing cultural and recreational facilities within North Warwickshire could be poor. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the closest settlements in North Warwickshire to the other districts, rather than on the very fringe of North Warwickshire; therefore people would be expected to have better access to existing cultural and recreational facilities within those settlements although it is noted</p>



SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>that those services could become overloaded if additional provision is not made. Distances to access cultural and recreational facilities in the other districts would also be slightly longer, although there may be better opportunities to use public transport, benefitting access for those without cars. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT4</b>, development would be focussed around public transport hubs throughout the Borough. While this would provide people (particularly those without a car) with good access to cultural and recreational facilities in locations around the Borough and further afield, additional investment would be required and distances to cultural and recreational facilities in the other districts would be long in some cases. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>The provision of a new settlement under <b>Option OUT5</b> would involve the provision of new services and facilities alongside housing and other development, which would ensure that residents of the new settlement have good access to cultural and recreational facilities close to their homes and would avoid existing facilities becoming overloaded. However, opportunities for new development to stimulate the viability and potential expansion of existing facilities elsewhere would be lost and residents may not be functionally linked with services in the other districts, depending on where the new settlement is located. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p>
7. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the assets of the natural environment of North Warwickshire, including landscape	--?	--?	?	--?	--?	<p><b>Option OUT1</b> would require some development within the Green Belt in the south and west of the district. This could have a negative effect on the landscape in terms of reducing open space and risking the coalescence of urban areas, although it is recognised that Green Belt land is not necessarily the most</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
character.						<p>sensitive in landscape terms. It is also noted that not all of the closest settlements could accommodate potentially large amounts of development in their existing forms, so this approach could significantly alter the character and shape of those settlements. A potential but uncertain significant negative effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would also require the release of land from the Green Belt, so could also have a significant negative effect although it is noted that focussing development at existing settlements could reduce landscape impacts in comparison with OUT1.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would focus development at public transport hubs around the Borough. It would also require some development within Green Belt and a potential significant negative effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> could have significant landscape impacts as the development of an entirely new settlement would be largely if not entirely on greenfield land and could be prominent visually, depending on its location. This option could also require the release of land from the Green Belt, although it may be possible to select a site based on minimising landscape impacts. Effects cannot be assessed in detail until the location is known; however a potential significant negative effect is identified.</p>
8. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment, including the cultural heritage.	-?	--?	?	-?	-?	<p>Under <b>Option OUT1</b>, development would be focussed along the western and southern edges of North Warwickshire Borough, where there is already extensive urbanisation including the M42 and M6 motorways, which reduces the potential for new development to adversely affect the setting of heritage features. However, it is still likely that some assets would be within proximity of development and a potential minor negative effect is identified.</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p><b>Option OUT2</b> would locate development at the settlements closest to other districts; therefore may be more likely to impact upon features such as listed buildings which tend to be more concentrated in built up areas. A potential significant negative effect is therefore identified.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would involve dispersed development, around public transport hubs. The effects will be largely uncertain depending on the location of specific development sites, although it is expected that there would be heritage assets in the towns and villages that could be affected by new development, particularly if this option were to stimulate additional transport infrastructure development; therefore a potential minor negative effect is identified.</p> <p>A new settlement under <b>Option OUT5</b> would direct development away from existing built up areas and therefore may be less likely to impact upon the setting of heritage features such as listed buildings. However, there may still be valuable heritage assets in rural areas that would be affected by the new development depending on its location, although it may be possible to select a location based on minimising impacts on heritage assets. A potential minor negative effect is therefore identified.</p>
9. Valuing, enhancing and protecting the biodiversity of North Warwickshire	-?	-?	?	-?	--/+?	<p>All of the effects on this SA objective are currently uncertain as they will depend to some extent on the specific location and design of development sites, which is not yet known for any of the options.</p> <p><b>Option OUT1</b> would focus development along the very edge of North Warwickshire's western and southern boundaries, outside of the main settlements; therefore it may be more likely to take place on greenfield land and result in habitat loss and/or disturbance to species. However, the presence of the M42 and other urbanisation in this area is likely to limit the potential for</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>such effects as there may already be existing high levels of disturbance. A potential minor negative effect is therefore identified although this is dependent on the location of development sites in relation to specific biodiversity features.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT2</b> development would be at existing settlements so may be less likely to result in habitat loss or disturbance to species, although some of the development would still be on greenfield sites and built up areas can still harbour valuable biodiversity. A potential minor negative effect is therefore identified although this is dependent on the location of development sites in relation to specific biodiversity features.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would focus development around the transport hubs throughout the Borough and would therefore be relatively widespread throughout the Borough. Development on greenfield land is likely, resulting in the potential loss of habitat; therefore a potential minor negative effect is identified.</p> <p>The development of a new settlement under <b>Option OUT5</b> is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land, which could impact upon biodiversity depending on the nature and value of the land. However, a new settlement could offer good opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure, in order to reduce habitat fragmentation and mitigate habitat loss from development, and it may be possible to select a location based on minimising impacts on biodiversity features. Therefore, a potentially mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect is identified, although this will depend largely on the location of the new settlement.</p>
10. Ensuring development makes efficient use of previously developed land, buildings and existing physical infrastructure in	--/+	++/-	?	-/++	--	<p><b>Option OUT1</b> is likely to result in the development of greenfield land as development would be focussed outside of the main settlements in North Warwickshire and the adjacent districts. This would also mean that it is less well-connected via existing</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
sustainable locations.						<p>infrastructure and it is noted that additional transport infrastructure might be needed to connect developments with the settlements in the adjacent districts. However, in terms of geographical proximity, development would be well-connected to the other districts. A mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT2</b> development would be located at the closest settlements in North Warwickshire to the district boundaries, so may offer some opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites in built up areas. However, Green Belt land would need to be released and most development is still likely to be on greenfield sites. Under this option, however, development would be better connected via public transport infrastructure to the other districts compared to OUT1 (although it is noted that the closest settlements may not allow for commuting via public transport), while still being reasonably close geographically. Existing settlements also represents a more sustainable location for new development. A mixed (significant positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT4</b>, development would be focussed at public transport hubs around the Borough. This dispersed development is not expected to offer good opportunities for redeveloping brownfield sites; however the development would be very well connected to existing and potential sustainable transport infrastructure. A mixed (minor negative and significant positive) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT5</b> a new settlement would be developed which it is assumed would be entirely or largely remote from existing physical infrastructure and would require significant new infrastructure development to support it. It is also likely to be mainly if not entirely on greenfield land. A significant negative effect is therefore likely.</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
11. Maintaining the resources of air, water and productive soil, minimising pollution levels.	+/-	+/--	?	+/-	+/--?	<p>Under <b>Option OUT1</b> levels of car use and the associated air pollution could be high as development would be located outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the neighbouring districts and would therefore be unlikely to be well-connected via public transport. However, locating development in North Warwickshire close to the border with other districts could mean that commuting distances to jobs and services there would be smaller, potentially enabling people to cycle. Development would be located outside of the AQMA that has been declared at Coleshill although there would be some development within reasonably close proximity of the town which may increase traffic there. However, the option is likely to result in the development of greenfield sites which could result in the loss of high quality soils, although it is noted that generally soil quality is higher in the central and northern parts of the Borough. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs and services in the other districts but are likely to have better public transport links which could reduce air pollution from car use (although it is noted that not all of the closest settlements would allow for commuting via public transport). However, journeys would be slightly longer and opportunities to walk and cycle are therefore likely to be very limited. In addition, development would be located at Coleshill where an AQMA has been declared, which could compound air pollution in that area. The option would result in the development of greenfield sites which could result in the loss of high quality soils, although it is noted that generally soil quality is higher in the central and northern parts of the Borough. A mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Option OUT4</b> would focus development at public transport hubs around the Borough which is likely to encourage the use of non-</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>car based modes of transport, to the benefit of air quality. However, under this option some development would be located a long way from the districts whose need it is proposed to meet so journeys may be longer and more likely to be undertaken by car. In addition, some development is directed to Coleshill under this option, where an AQMA has already been declared. The dispersed nature of development under this option means that it is difficult to assess the likely impacts on soils until specific development sites are known; however some development is directed to the central and northern parts of the Borough where high quality soils are found and the fact that development would take place outside of the largest towns could increase the likelihood of productive agricultural soils being lost. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> would involve developing a new settlement, which would function as a relatively self-contained town due to the provision of commercial development, services and facilities alongside housing. This should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day and the associated air pollution. However, as the housing is being proposed to meet the needs of other districts, people are still likely to commute elsewhere for work. In addition, the development of a new settlement would involve the loss of a large area of greenfield land which could be high quality agricultural soil, depending on the location which is not yet known, although it may be possible to select a location based on avoiding BMV land. Similarly, the proximity of the new settlement to the existing AQMA at Coleshill is not known. A mixed (minor positive and significant negative) effect is therefore likely although there are currently uncertainties until the location of the new settlement is known.</p>
12. Minimising North Warwickshire's contribution to the causes of climate change whilst implementing a managed	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	+/-?	The effects of the five options on this SA objective will depend to some extent on the design of built development rather than its spatial distribution, which is not known at this stage. However, the options will affect this SA objective in terms of the extent to which they will result in car use, and whether they direct

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
response to its unavoidable impacts.						<p>development to the areas of the Borough at highest risk from flooding as flood risk is expected to increase as a result of climate change.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT1</b> levels of car use and the associated emissions could be high as development would be located outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the neighbouring districts and would therefore be unlikely to be well-connected via public transport. However, locating development in North Warwickshire close to the border with other districts could mean that commuting distances to jobs and services there would be smaller, potentially enabling people to cycle. Flood risk in this part of the Borough is not generally high although effects will depend on the specific location of development. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs and services in the other districts but are likely to have better public transport links which could reduce emissions from car use (although it is noted that not all of the closest settlements would allow for commuting via public transport). However, journeys would be slightly longer and opportunities to walk and cycle are therefore likely to be very limited. In addition, there are some areas of high flood risk in this part of the Borough which could be affected, depending on the location of development sites. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore also likely for this option.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT4</b> development could be located some distance from the districts which it is proposed for, which could mean that levels of car use and the associated emissions are higher as people are travelling over longer distances. However, focussing development around public transport hubs could improve levels of sustainable transport use, reducing emissions from transport. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative)</p>



SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> would involve developing a new settlement, which would function as a relatively self-contained town due to the provision of commercial development, services and facilities alongside housing. This should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day and the associated greenhouse gas emissions. However, as the housing being provided would be to meet the needs of other districts, it is assumed that people would still largely commute to work elsewhere and depending on the location of the new settlement, this distance could be either short or long and levels of car use and the associated emissions could be high. The proximity of the new settlement to flood risk areas is also unknown at this stage. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified although this is uncertain until the location of the new settlement in relation to the other districts is known.</p>
13. Reducing overall energy use through sustainable design, increasing energy efficiency and increasing the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the five options will have a direct effect on this SA objective, which will be affected by the design of development and the behaviour of residents, rather than the spatial distribution of development.
14. Using natural resources efficiently	0	0	0	0	0	All of the options would result in the same amount of built development and therefore resource consumption. The spatial location of development could affect the sterilisation of minerals resources. Mineral deposits in the Borough include sand and gravel to the west and north-east and exposed coalfield (predominantly a band running north to south from Shuttington through Polesworth/Dordon, as far as Ansley). Minerals Safeguarding Areas for the whole of Warwickshire are identified in the British Geological Survey document, 'Minerals Safeguarding Areas for Warwickshire' (Figure A16). When all types of safeguarding areas are taken into account, the vast majority of

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						the Borough is covered and so it is not possible to identify differences between the options with regards to the sterilisation of resources. Negligible effects are therefore identified for all five options.
15. Increasing use of public transport, cycling and walking and reducing use of the private car.	+/-	+/-	?	+/-	+/-?	<p>Under <b>Option OUT1</b> levels of car use could be high as development would be located outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the neighbouring districts and would therefore be unlikely to be well-connected via public transport. However, locating development in North Warwickshire close to the border with other districts could mean that commuting distances to jobs and services there would be smaller, potentially enabling people to cycle, particularly as the development would in most cases be on the side of the motorways closest to the other districts (motorways could otherwise form a barrier to access). A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs and services in the other districts but are likely to have better public transport links which would improve access for those without a car (although it is noted that not all of the closest settlements would allow for commuting via public transport). However, journeys would be slightly longer and opportunities to walk and cycle are therefore likely to be very limited, particularly as more development would take place on the side of the motorways furthest from the other districts. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore also likely for this option.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT4</b> development could be located some distance from the districts which it is proposed for, which could mean that levels of car use are higher as people travelling over longer distances may be more inclined to drive. However,</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						<p>focussing development around public transport hubs could still go some way towards improving levels of sustainable transport use, despite the longer journey lengths. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> would involve developing a new settlement, which would function as a relatively self-contained town due to the provision of commercial development, services and facilities alongside housing. This should mean that people can work and access services closer to home, which would reduce the need for car use day-to-day. However, as the housing being provided would be to meet the needs of other districts, it is assumed that people would still largely commute to work elsewhere and depending on the location of the new settlement, this distance could be either short or long and levels of car use could be high. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified although this is uncertain until the location of the new settlement in relation to the other districts is known.</p>
16. Encouraging and enabling waste minimisation, reuse, recycling and recovery to divert resources away from the waste stream.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the five options will have a direct effect on this SA objective, which will instead be affected by the onsite waste management practices used.
17. Encouraging local sourcing of goods and materials.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options for the distribution of growth will have a direct effect on this SA objective.
18. Creation of a modern, healthy and diverse economy which is able to adapt to changes in the wider economy while remaining relevant to the needs of local people.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options will have a direct effect on this SA objective. While the spatial distribution of development will influence the extent to which people are able to access the jobs that they need, this is addressed under SA objective 19 below. The spatial distribution of development will not affect the health of the local economy as the same amount of employment land would be provided under all five options.
19. Maintaining and enhancing employment	+/-	+/-	?	--/+	+/-?	Under <b>Option OUT1</b> development would be closer geographically for people commuting to other districts for work, although the

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
opportunities and reducing the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs.						<p>fact that the development would be outside of the main settlements in both North Warwickshire and the adjacent districts could mean that transport connections for those without a car are limited. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified.</p> <p><b>Option OUT2</b> would focus development at the closest settlements to the relevant border, so people would still be relatively close geographically to jobs in the other districts but are likely to have better public transport links which would improve access for those without a car (although it is noted that not all of the closest settlements would allow for commuting via public transport). However, journeys would be slightly longer and the housing less functionally linked to employment in other districts. A mixed (minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore also likely for this option.</p> <p>The effects of <b>Option OUT3</b> on this objective are uncertain and will depend on which preferred option is selected for the whole of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Under <b>Option OUT4</b> development could be located some distance from the districts which it is proposed for, which could mean that it is difficult for residents to access employment in the other districts if this requires commuting longer distances. However, focussing development around public transport hubs could improve access to jobs for people without cars, although journey lengths would be longer from some parts of the district. A mixed (significant negative and minor positive) effect is therefore likely.</p> <p><b>Option OUT5</b> would involve the development of a new settlement, with commercial development to be provided alongside housing. This would ensure that jobs are provided for the growing population, in a location that is accessible from the new homes even for people without cars. However, as the housing being provided would be to meet the needs of other districts, it is assumed that people would still largely commute to work elsewhere and depending on the location of the new settlement, this distance could be either short or long. A mixed</p>

SA objectives	OUT1	OUT2	OUT3	OUT4	OUT5	Commentary/justification
						(minor positive and minor negative) effect is therefore identified although this is uncertain until the location of the new settlement in relation to the other districts is known.
20. Ensuring that people of all ages are provided with the opportunity to obtain the skills, knowledge, confidence and understanding to achieve their full potential.	0	0	0	0	0	None of the options will have a direct effect on this SA objective. While the spatial distribution of development will influence the extent to which people are able to access jobs and the associated opportunities for work-based training and skills development, this is addressed under SA objective 19 above.