

Appendix III: SA of Strategic Options for defining Built Up Area Boundaries

| Categories of Significance | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| Symbol | Meaning | Sustainability Effect |
| ++ | Major Positive | Proposed development would resolve existing sustainability problem |
| + | Minor Positive | No sustainability constraints and proposed development acceptable in principle |
| 0 | Neutral | Neutral effect |
| ? | Uncertain | Uncertain or Unknown Effects |
| - | Minor Negative | Likely sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible |
| -- | Major Negative | Problematical because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive |
| N/A | Not Applicable | Used where SA Objectives are no longer applicable |

| Option Number | Approach to Defining Built-Up Area Boundaries (BUABs) |
|---------------|---|
| 1 | Boundary drawn tightly around physical confines of settlement, in particular with regard to the existing built up areas |
| 2 | Boundary drawn loosely around settlement allowing space for development, particularly around the edges of existing built up areas |
| 3 | No boundary |

| MAIN RURAL CENTRES | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty | Boundary Options | | |
| | | Tight Boundary | Loose Boundary | No Boundary |
| 1. Heritage | <p>The 8 Main Rural Centres contain a range of heritage assets, including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monuments¹. These heritage assets characterise the Rural Centres, and development in the settlements can have effects on both the assets and their settings.</p> <p>By defining a tight boundary around the Rural Centres development is more likely to be in close proximity to existing heritage assets, specifically Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings. Therefore, there is the potential for cumulative negative effects on the historic environment for Rural Centres. However, mitigation is available through Core Strategy Policy CS.8, which will ensure development is appropriately designed and located such that it does not result in significant effects. A tight boundary could also use specific criteria to ensure that certain heritage assets were not included within the boundary, providing further protection. Therefore, a neutral effect is considered for the tight boundary option.</p> <p>A loose boundary around the Rural Centres will enable development to occur on the periphery of the settlements, which is likely to be further from designated heritage features which are largely located in the historic centres of the Main Rural Centres². Therefore, a loose boundary has the potential for development to avoid heritage assets with a potential minor positive effect.</p> <p>No boundary around the settlements would not effectively control development, and could lead to inappropriate development that degrades the historic character of the Main Rural Centres and have significant effects on the setting of heritage assets. However, mitigation would still be available through Core Strategy Policy CS.8 which would protect designated</p> | 0 | + | 0? |

¹ Defra (2016) Magic Map [Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>]

² Ibid.

| | | | | |
|---|--|----|----|---|
| | heritage assets and their setting, and reducing potential negative effects to neutral, however there is an element of uncertainty. | | | |
| 2. Landscape | The District contains both AONB designation and Green Belt designation ³ , and the open nature of the countryside is valued attribute for the local area. | ++ | + | - |
| | <p>The use of a tight boundary around a Main Rural Centre will protect the surrounding landscape. This will prevent encroachment into the neighbouring landscape, and ensure important settlement gaps are maintained. Therefore, a major positive effect is considered for using a tight boundary.</p> <p>A loose boundary would likely result in some development on the edge of the Main Rural Centres, representing some encroachment into the surrounding landscape and a possible reduction in some important settlement gaps, with potential cumulative effects. However, mitigation is available through Core Strategy Policy, and there is still the potential for the redevelopment of brownfield sites, and therefore a minor positive effect is considered.</p> <p>No boundary could result in development in landscape areas with high or medium sensitivity, and may result in a degradation of local landscape character, with a potential minor negative effect.</p> | | | |
| 3. Biodiversity & Geodiversity | There are no internationally designated biodiversity sites in the District, however there are numerous SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites, and areas of Priority Habitat ⁴ . | + | +? | 0 |
| | <p>The drawing of a tight boundary around the Main Rural Centres will likely encompass the built area which would exclude designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites. Therefore, this will protect local biodiversity. Potential for a minor positive effect.</p> <p>Similarly, a loose boundary will also likely exclude designated biodiversity sites and areas of Priority Habitat, although some land surrounding the Main Rural Centres contains Priority Habitat and may be within a loose boundary. However, mitigation through Core Strategy Policy CS.6 will mitigate against the effects of development on any biodiversity, and therefore a minor positive effect is considered for the boundary option, with some uncertainty.</p> | | | |

³ Defra (2016) Magic Map [Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>]

⁴ Ibid.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|----|----|
| | Without a boundary, there is the potential for development to be poorly located with regard to local biodiversity, and this could lead to a loss or degradation of local biodiversity and geodiversity, with potential cumulative negative effects. However, development will still need to comply with Local Plan Policy, including Policy CS.6 of the Core Strategy, which will prevent significant negative effects on biodiversity. Overall neutral effect considered for the boundary option. | | | |
| 4. Flooding | There are areas of flood risk dispersed throughout the District ⁵ . A tight boundary will allow for the exclusion of areas of flood risk from the potential developable area, with associated positive effects. | + | 0 | 0 |
| | A loose boundary or no boundary may result in flood zone located within the boundary, with negative effects. However, as any development will still need to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS.4, this will mitigate against any negative effects with likely residual neutral effects for both options. | | | |
| 5. Climate Change: Accessibility & Traffic | Defining a tight boundary around the Main Rural Centres could result in reduced access for any future development to the main road network and increase traffic within the centre of the settlement where congestion may be an existing problem. However, any future development would probably have good access to footpath network, and mitigation is available through Core Strategy Policies CS.25 and CS.26. Therefore, a residual neutral effect is considered. | + | 0 | - |
| | A loose boundary around the settlement could allow for some development on the periphery. This could be better located to main roads entering and exiting the settlement, providing good access to the highway network. Furthermore, this would be less likely to result in an increase in congestion within the centre of the settlements. Potential for a minor positive effect. Without a boundary development could be located away from the Rural Service Centre, and not have appropriate access to the highway network or good access to the settlement, with a minor negative effect. | | | |
| 6. Climate Change: Green Infrastructure | A tight boundary around the Rural Service Centres can use defined criteria that can exclude public open spaces and any Green Infrastructure assets, protecting these from development pressure with positive effects. | + | 0? | 0? |
| | | | | |

⁵ Environment Agency (2016) Flood Map [Online at <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>]

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|---|
| | A loose boundary may include existing public open spaces and Green Infrastructure features, which may therefore be lost or degraded as a result of development. However, a looser boundary may also allow for the creation of new recreation spaces or Green Infrastructure on the periphery of the settlement, with potential positive effects. Some uncertainty remains, and a residual neutral effect is considered. This is also applicable for no boundary, where there may be a loss of recreational space but also the potential for a gain. | | | |
| 7. Natural resources (Minerals & Agricultural Land) | A tight boundary around the Main Rural Centres will exclude greenfield land and mineral safeguarded areas, with positive effects through the protection of soil resources and mineral resources. | + | +? | - |
| | A looser boundary would have the potential to result in the loss of greenfield land on the boundary of the settlement, which may include best and most versatile agricultural land. However, criteria could be used to eliminate areas of greenfield with best and most versatile agricultural land from the boundary, with the potential for a minor positive effect although some uncertainty remains. Without a boundary development could result in the loss of greenfield land, best and most versatile agricultural land and could be within Mineral Safeguarded Areas. Therefore, there is the potential for a minor negative effect. | | | |
| 8. Pollution (Air Quality & Water Quality) | A tight boundary around the Main Rural Centres may reduce the reliance on private vehicle use and therefore maintain or improve air quality as any development will have good access to sustainable transport and services/facilities. However, there could also be an increase in traffic within the centre of settlement, including designated AQMAs ⁶ . | + | + | 0 |
| | A looser boundary would still have the potential to reduce the reliance on private vehicle use and therefore improve or maintain air quality, but this is less certain than the tight boundary. No effects identified for the no boundary solution. Both tight and loose boundaries can avoid water bodies where possible, including streams and rivers with poor identified chemical or ecological status, and therefore help ensure | | | |

⁶ Defra (2016) AQMA Interactive Map (<https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps>)

| | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-----|-----|
| | <p>future development will not have an effect on water quality. Furthermore, the boundaries can be drawn around any existing Safeguarded Water Zones or Vulnerability Zones.</p> <p>With no boundary development may be inappropriately located adjacent to water bodies where there is a risk of a loss of water quality, or within Safeguarded Water and Vulnerability Zones. However, mitigation available through Core Strategy Policy CS.4 can protect the water environment, reducing potential negative effects to neutral.</p> | | | |
| 9. Waste | The definition of boundary lines around the settlements is not considered likely to have an effect on the SA Objective. | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Transport | <p>A tight boundary around the Rural Service Centres has the potential to help reduce the reliance on private vehicles for future development. A tighter boundary means any future development will likely have good access to bus stops and other sustainable transport links within the settlements. Development is also more likely to have good access to a wide range of key services/facilities available within the Rural Service Centres, which will help reduce the reliance on private vehicle use, and therefore a major positive effect is considered.</p> <p>A looser boundary is still likely to reduce the reliance on private vehicle use. However, there is a chance that development on the periphery of the settlements would have reduced access to bus stops and services/facilities compared with the tight boundary. Therefore, a minor positive effect is considered.</p> <p>Without a boundary development could be located beyond walking distance to public transport and services/facilities, and therefore has the potential to increase the reliance on private vehicle use. A minor negative effect is therefore considered.</p> <p><i>Please note – uncertainty added in response to representations made in 2018 consultation</i></p> | ++? | +? | -? |
| 11. Reduce barriers for rural communities | | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|----|---|
| <p>12. Protect the settlements identity</p> | <p>The implementation of a tight boundary around the Rural Service Centres will protect the existing pattern of the settlements, as the boundary will encompass the current built form and prevent extensions to the settlements, with a minor positive effect.</p> <p>With a looser boundary around the Rural Service Centres there is the potential that development will occur on the periphery of the settlements. This may partially erode settlement gaps and alter the built form of the settlements. However, appropriate design and location of development can mitigate against this, and a residual neutral effect is considered. Some uncertainty remains.</p> <p>Without a boundary, the settlement pattern and identity of the settlement would likely be lost or degraded, as development could be located in inappropriate areas and therefore a cumulative minor negative effect is considered.</p> | + | 0? | - |
| <p>13. Housing</p> | <p>The use of boundaries around settlement can effectively control where new development occurs, and ensure housing is appropriately located, with positive effects for both a tight and loose boundary.</p> <p>With no boundary controlling the location of development, future housing development is less likely to benefit the local communities and achieve sustainable development. Therefore, a minor negative effect is considered.</p> | + | + | - |
| <p>14. Communities & Health</p> | <p>The use of a tight boundary can ensure that any existing infrastructure or development that would be a conflicting neighbouring land use for future housing development can be removed from potentially developable areas, with positive effects for health. The use of a boundary will have positive effects for local communities.</p> <p>A looser boundary may result in development being located adjacent to conflicting neighbouring land uses on the periphery of the settlement, however it is likely that a looser boundary could still avoid these. A minor positive effect with some uncertainty.</p> <p>Without a boundary development, there is less enforcement to prevent development being located in close proximity to conflicting land uses, with a potential minor negative effect.</p> | + | +? | - |
| <p>15. Economy & Employment</p> | <p>Both tight and loose boundaries can help support the Rural Service Centres economies, and protect existing employment land, with minor positive effects.</p> | + | + | - |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | No boundary would less likely support the economies of Rural Service Centres, and development could be remote with reduced access to employment opportunities, with a minor negative effect. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| LOCAL SERVICE VILLAGES | | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| SA Objective | Assessment of Effects Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty | Boundary Options | | |
| | | Tight Boundary | Loose Boundary | No Boundary |
| 1. Heritage | <p>The Local Service Villages (LSVs) contain a range of heritage assets, including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Scheduled Monuments⁷.</p> <p>By defining a tight boundary around the LSVs development is more likely to be in close proximity to existing heritage assets, specifically Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings. Therefore, there is the potential to for negative effects on the historic environment for LSVs. However, mitigation is available through Core Strategy Policy CS.8, which will ensure development is appropriately designed and located such that it does not result in significant effects for the setting of the designated features. A tight boundary could also use specific criteria to ensure that certain heritage assets were not included within the boundary, providing further protection. Therefore, a neutral effect is considered for the tight boundary option.</p> <p>A loose boundary around the LSVs will enable development to occur on the periphery of the settlements, which is likely to be further from designated heritage features within the villages. However, as the LSVs vary in size, a looser boundary can still result in development being in areas where effects on heritage assets can occur. Mitigation is available through CS.8, and therefore a minor positive effect is considered for the boundary option.</p> <p>No boundary around the LSVs would not effectively control development, and could lead to inappropriate development that degrades the historic character of the villages with potential cumulative effects. However, mitigation would still be available through Core Strategy Policy CS.8 which would protect designated heritage assets, and reducing potential negative effects to neutral, however there is an element of uncertainty.</p> | 0 | + | 0? |

⁷ Defra (2016) Magic Map [Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>]

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|----------|----------|
| <p>2. Landscape</p> | <p>The District contains both AONB designation and Green Belt designation⁸, and the open nature of the countryside is valued attribute for the local area.</p> <p>The use of a tight boundary around a LSV will protect the surrounding landscape. This will prevent encroachment into the neighbouring landscape, and ensure important settlement gaps are maintained. Therefore, a major positive effect is considered for using a tight boundary.</p> <p>A loose boundary would likely result in some development on the edge of the LSVs, representing some encroachment into the surrounding landscape and a possible reduction in some important settlement gaps. This is likely to be more noticeable for the smaller LSVs where the landscape plays a vital part in the characterisation of the settlements. However, mitigation is available through Core Strategy Policy which can ensure development is appropriately designed and located to reduce potential effects on the landscape, and therefore a minor positive effect is considered.</p> <p>No boundary could result in development in landscape areas with high or medium sensitivity, and may result in a cumulative degradation of local landscape character, with a potential minor negative effect.</p> | <p>++</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>-</p> |
| <p>3. Biodiversity & Geodiversity</p> | <p>There are no internationally designated biodiversity sites in the District, however there are numerous SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites, and areas of Priority Habitat⁹.</p> <p>The drawing of a tight boundary around the LSVs will likely encompass the built area which would exclude designated biodiversity or geodiversity sites. Therefore, this will protect local biodiversity. Potential for a minor positive effect.</p> <p>Similarly, a loose boundary will also likely exclude designated biodiversity sites and areas of Priority Habitat. However, some land surrounding the LSVs contains Priority Habitat and have the potential for local biodiversity value and may be within a loosely drawn boundary. However, mitigation through Core Strategy Policy CS.6 will mitigate against the effects of development on any biodiversity, and therefore a minor positive effect is considered for the boundary option, with some uncertainty.</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>0</p> |

⁸ Defra (2016) Magic Map [Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>]

⁹ Ibid.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | Without a boundary, there is the potential for development to be poorly located with regard to local biodiversity, and this could lead to a cumulative loss or degradation of local biodiversity and geodiversity. However, development will still need to comply with Local Plan Policy, including Policy CS.6 of the Core Strategy, which will prevent significant negative effects on biodiversity. Overall neutral effect considered for the boundary option. | | | |
| 4. Flooding | There are areas of flood risk dispersed throughout the District ¹⁰ . A tight boundary will allow for the exclusion of areas of flood risk from the potential developable area, with associated positive effects. | + | 0 | 0 |
| | A loose boundary or no boundary may result in flood zone located within the boundary, with negative effects. However, as any development will still need to comply with Core Strategy Policy CS.4, this will mitigate against any negative effects with likely residual neutral effects for both options. | | | |
| 5. Climate Change: Accessibility & Traffic | Defining a tight boundary around the villages could result in reduced access for any future development to the main road network and increase traffic within the centre of the settlements, however congestion is less likely to be an existing problem in the LSVs compared to the Main Rural Centres ¹¹ . Any future development would probably have good access to footpath network, and mitigation is available through Core Strategy Policies CS.25 and CS.26. Therefore, a residual neutral effect is considered. | + | 0 | - |
| | <p>A loose boundary around the settlement could allow for some development on the periphery. This could be better located to main roads entering and exiting the settlement, providing good access to the highway network. Furthermore, this would be less likely to result in an increase in congestion within the centre of the settlements. Potential for a minor positive effect.</p> <p>Without a boundary development could be located away from the Villages, and not have appropriate access to the highway network or good access to the settlements, with a minor negative effect.</p> | | | |

¹⁰ Environment Agency (2016) Flood Map [Online at <https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/>]

¹¹ Warwickshire County Council (2011) Warwickshire Local Transport Plan

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|----|----|
| <p>6. Climate Change: Green Infrastructure</p> | <p>A tight boundary around the LSVs can use defined criteria that can exclude public open spaces and any Green Infrastructure assets, protecting these from development pressure with positive effects.</p> <p>A loose boundary may include existing public open spaces and Green Infrastructure features, which may therefore be lost or degraded as a result of development. LSVs have fewer public open spaces than the Main Rural Centres, and therefore any loss of existing provision is likely to be significant. Due to the potential scale of any future development at the LSVs, a looser boundary is less likely to allow for the creation of new recreation spaces or Green Infrastructure on the periphery of the settlement than at the Rural Service Centres. Some uncertainty remains, and a residual neutral effect is considered for the boundary option.</p> <p>This is also applicable for no boundary, where there may be a loss of recreational space or Green Infrastructure. Overall neutral effect with uncertainty for this option.</p> | + | 0? | 0? |
| <p>7. Natural resources (Minerals & Agricultural Land)</p> | <p>A tight boundary around the LSVs will exclude greenfield land and mineral safeguarded areas, with positive effects through the protection of soil resources and mineral resources.</p> <p>A looser boundary would have the potential to result in the loss of greenfield land on the boundary of the settlement, which may include best and most versatile agricultural land. However, criteria could be used to eliminate areas of greenfield with best and most versatile agricultural land from the boundary, with the potential for a minor positive effect although some uncertainty remains.</p> <p>Without a boundary development could result in the loss of greenfield land, best and most versatile agricultural land and could be within Mineral Safeguarded Areas. Therefore, there is the potential for a minor negative effect.</p> | + | +? | - |
| <p>8. Pollution (Air Quality & Water Quality)</p> | <p>A tight boundary around the LSVs may reduce the reliance on private vehicle use and therefore maintain or improve air quality as any development will have good access to sustainable transport and services/facilities. None of the LSVs contain an AQMA¹².</p> | + | + | 0 |

¹² Defra (2016) AQMA Interactive Map (<https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/maps>)

| | | | | |
|----------------------|--|----|----|----|
| | <p>A looser boundary would still have the potential to reduce the reliance on private vehicle use and therefore improve or maintain air quality, but this is less certain than the tight boundary.</p> <p>No effects identified for the no boundary solution.</p> <p>Both tight and loose boundaries can avoid water bodies where possible, including streams and rivers with poor identified chemical or ecological status, and therefore help ensure future development will not have an effect on water quality. Furthermore, the boundaries can be drawn around any existing Safeguarded Water Zones or Vulnerability Zones.</p> <p>With no boundary development may be inappropriately located adjacent to water bodies where there is a risk of a loss of water quality, or within Safeguarded Water and Vulnerability Zones. However, mitigation available through Core Strategy Policy CS.4 can protect the water environment, reducing potential negative effects to neutral.</p> | | | |
| 9. Waste | <p>The definition of boundary lines around the settlements is not considered likely to have an effect on the SA Objective.</p> | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. Transport | <p>A tight boundary around the LSVs has the potential to help reduce the reliance on private vehicles for future development. A tighter boundary means any future development will likely have good access to bus stops and other sustainable transport links within the settlements. However, the availability of public transport varies between LSVs and therefore there is some uncertainty on the extent of the positive effects.</p> <p>Development is also more likely to have good access to a wide range of key services/facilities available within the LSVs for a tight boundary than the other boundary options, but available services/facilities are fewer than those available in the Main Rural Centres. The tight barrier still has the potential to reduce the reliance on private vehicle use, and therefore a minor positive effect is considered.</p> <p>A looser boundary is still likely to reduce the reliance on private vehicle use. However, there is a chance that development on the periphery of the settlements would have reduced access to bus stops and services/facilities compared with the tight boundary. Therefore, a minor positive effect is considered with uncertainty.</p> | +? | +? | -? |

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|------------|------------|
| | Without a boundary development could be located beyond walking distance to public transport and services/facilities, and therefore has the potential to increase the reliance on private vehicle use. A minor negative effect is therefore considered. | | | |
| 11. Reduce barriers for rural communities | | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| 12. Protect the settlements identity | The implementation of a tight boundary around the LSVs will protect the existing pattern of the settlements, as the boundary will encompass the current built form and prevent extensions to the settlements, with a minor positive effect. | + | 0? | - |
| | <p>With a looser boundary around the LSVs there is the potential that development will occur on the periphery of the settlements. This may partially erode settlement gaps and alter the built form of the settlements This is likely to be more significant than the potential changes at the Rural Service Centres due to the smaller LSVs and their variable settlement patterns. However, appropriate deign and location of development can mitigate against this, and a residual neutral effect is considered. Some uncertainty remains.</p> <p>Without a boundary, the settlement pattern and identity of the settlement would likely be lost or degraded, as development could be located in inappropriate areas and therefore a minor negative effect is considered.</p> | | | |
| 13. Housing | The use of boundaries around settlement can effectively control where new development occurs, and ensure housing is appropriately located, with positive effects for both a tight and loose boundary. | + | + | - |
| | With no boundary controlling the location of development, future housing development is less likely to benefit the local communities and achieve sustainable development. Therefore, a minor negative effect is considered. | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|----|---|
| 14. Communities & Health | The use of a tight boundary can ensure that any existing infrastructure or development that would be a conflicting neighbouring land use for future housing development can be removed from potentially developable areas, with positive effects for health. The use of a boundary will have positive effects for local communities. | + | +? | - |
| | A looser boundary may result in development being located adjacent to conflicting neighbouring land uses on the periphery of the settlement, however it is likely that a looser boundary could still avoid these. A minor positive effect with some uncertainty. | | | |
| | Without a boundary, there is less enforcement to prevent development being located in close proximity to conflicting land uses, with a potential minor negative effect. | | | |
| 15. Economy & Employment | Both tight and loose boundaries can help support the LSVs economies, and protect existing employment land, with minor positive effects. | + | + | - |
| | No boundary would less likely support the economies of LSVs, and development could be remote with reduced access to employment opportunities, with a minor negative effect. | | | |