



North West Leicestershire District Council
Local Plan Substantive Review:
Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report
of the Spatial Options



Date: 15th September 2022

Prepared by:

ClearLead Consulting Limited
The Barn, Cadhay, Ottery St Mary, Devon, EX11 1QT, UK

Quality Management

Issue/revision	Issue 1	Revision 1	Revision 2	Revision 3	Revision 4
Report Status	DRAFT	REVISED DRAFT	FINAL VERSION	DRAFT FINAL (incorporating additional option)	FINAL (incorporating additional option)
Date	24/06/21	27/07/21	06/09/21	31/08/22	15/09/22
Prepared by	L Dunkerley / I Teague/ C Stanton	L Dunkerley	L Dunkerley	L Dunkerley / I Teague/	L Dunkerley
Signature					
Checked by	J Mitchell	J Mitchell	J Mitchell	J Mitchell	J Mitchell
Signature					
Authorised by	J Mitchell	J Mitchell	J Mitchell	J Mitchell	J Mitchell
Signature					
Project number	C0290	C0290	C0290	C0290	C0290

LIMITATIONS

This report has been prepared by ClearLead Consulting Limited solely for the use of the Client and those parties with whom a warranty agreement has been executed, or with whom an assignment has been agreed. Should any third party wish to use or rely upon the contents of the report, written approval must be sought from ClearLead Consulting Limited; a charge may be levied against such approval.

ClearLead Consulting Limited accepts no responsibility or liability for:

- a) the consequences of this document being used for any purpose or project other than for which it was commissioned, and
- b) the use of this document by any third party with whom an agreement has not been executed.

The work undertaken to provide the basis of this report comprised a study of available documented information from a variety of sources (including the Client) and discussions with relevant authorities and other interested parties. The opinions given in this report have been dictated by the finite data on which they are based and are relevant only to the purpose for which the report was commissioned. The information reviewed should not be considered exhaustive and has been accepted in good faith as providing true and representative data pertaining to site conditions. Should additional information become available which may affect the opinions expressed in this report, ClearLead Consulting Limited reserves the right to review such information and, if warranted, to modify the opinions accordingly.

It should be noted that any recommendations identified in this report are based on information provided by the Client and as gathered during the site survey. In some cases access cannot be granted to all areas of the site, in these instances and in the absence of information to the contrary, ClearLead Consulting Limited will use the information provided to complete the report.



ISO 9001
ISO 14001
ISO 45001

Certificate Number. 16135

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Health Impact Assessment & Equalities Impact Assessment	1
1.3 Purpose and Structure of this Report	2
2 Background to the Spatial Options for Housing.....	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 The Options ('Reasonable Alternatives').....	6
3 Methodology.....	10
3.1 Introduction	10
3.2 GIS and RAG rating.....	10
3.3 Spatial Options Assessment Criteria	20
4 Results of the Assessment of the Spatial Options	23
4.1 Introduction	23
4.2 Individual performance of each Spatial Option	23
5 Comparison Assessment of Option 7b and Option 10	40
5.1 Introduction.....	40
5.2 Comparison.....	40
6 Overall performance of the Spatial Options	41
7 Next Steps	45

Executive Summary

North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) are currently undertaking a Substantive Review of the Local Plan. The next stage of the Local Plan review and the supporting Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process is to consider all reasonable alternatives for the spatial distribution of growth within the district and identify which of the reasonable alternatives could be taken forward.

This document is an interim SA report to support consultation on NWLDC's Spatial Options Report. It does not constitute the formal SA report, which will be prepared at a later date to accompany the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19).

The SA of the spatial options was undertaken between April and September 2021 and comprised 9 spatial options. This work integrated with the work the Council has undertaken on the development of the Spatial Options. The consultation on NWLDC's Development Strategy and Policy Options Report ran between 17 January and 14 March 2022. Following this consultation, the Council identified an additional option to be tested through the SA process referred to as Option 10 in this document. This document provides a full record of all the spatial options tested and the findings of these options assessments, including the additional spatial option.

There is potential for further options to be developed once the unmet need of Leicester is established and the redistribution of this unmet need is agreed by the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. These will be assessed following the same method later in the SA process if required.

In summary, four different housing growth scenarios were identified by NWLDC, along with a number of spatial options for how growth might be distributed across the district as reasonable alternatives for growth in the district. Overall, the assessment found at this high-level stage that five of the options (Options 1, 7a, 7b, 8 and 10) tend to perform better and have more potential significant positive effects compared with the other options where no potential significant positive effects were identified. Of these, Options 1 and 7a are for a lower growth scenario and Options 7b, 8 and 10 are for a higher growth scenario.

Across many of the options there are issues with two of the growth scenarios (High 1 and High 2) as detailed in the report, which have more potential significant negative effects and constraints particularly in relation to inequalities, travel, landscape/townscape and efficient use of land (SO2, SO8, SO13-14). A higher number of potential significant negative effects were also recorded for the higher growth scenario options (2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7b and 9b), due to the greater level of development required compared with the lower growth scenario options.

These were the key findings at this interim stage and once exact details on the location of sites is known this could improve the certainty of these assessments and could modify some uncertain effects, which will help further inform the development of a 'preferred spatial strategy option'.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) are currently undertaking a Substantive Review of the Local Plan. As part of the integrated assessment (Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Equality Impact Assessment and Health Impact Assessment) process of the Local Plan Substantive Review a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) scoping report was prepared and published in 2020¹, which presented detailed baseline information, key sustainability issues and data gaps. The next stage of the Local Plan review and the SA process is to consider all reasonable alternatives for the spatial distribution of growth within the district and identify which of the reasonable alternatives could be taken forward. This report presents the interim SA findings of the assessment of reasonable alternatives for the spatial distribution options Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment.

SA of Local Plans is required under sections 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) also requires SA of Local Plans. The SA must incorporate the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations). The SEA Regulations transpose the SEA Directive (2001/42/EC) into English law and applies to a range of plans and programmes, including Local Plans. The SEA Regulations aim at a high level of protection of the environment, and to integrate the consideration of the environment into the preparation and adoption of plans and with a view to promoting sustainable development.

Within the context of local planning in England, it is accepted practice to integrate the requirements of SA and SEA into a single assessment process, as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/>. The purpose of SA is to appraise the environmental, social and economic effects of plans and programmes. The SA 'testing' of the Local Plan policies and their reasonable alternatives will help to develop the most sustainable policies and proposals as an integral part of the plan's development.

1.2 Health Impact Assessment & Equalities Impact Assessment

A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a means of assessing the potential impacts of policies, plans and projects on health. HIA is not a statutory requirement of the Local Plan preparation

¹ [Sustainability Appraisal - North West Leicestershire District Council \(nwleics.gov.uk\)](https://www.nwleics.gov.uk)

process. However, Planning Practice Guidance² states that ‘Local planning authorities should ensure that health & wellbeing and health infrastructure are considered in local and neighbourhood plans and in planning decision making’.

An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a way of measuring the potential impact (positive, negative or neutral) that a policy, function or service may have on different groups protected by equalities legislation, notably the Equalities Act 2010. This Act places a general duty on the Council as a public body to pay due regard to advancing equality, fostering good relations and eliminating discrimination for people sharing certain protected characteristics.

1.3 Purpose and Structure of this Report

This document is an Interim SA report to support NWLDC in determining what the Development Strategy for the Local Plan should be.

The SA of the spatial options was undertaken between April and September 2021 and comprised 9 spatial options. This work integrated with the work the Council has undertaken on the development of the Spatial Options. The consultation on NWLDC’s Development Strategy and Policy Options Report ran between 17 January and 14 March 2022. In this consultation report the Council set out their assessment of these options and which options should or should not be taken forward. It also identified Option 7b as the preferred option under the High 2 growth scenario with Option 3a preferred under the High 1 growth scenario.

Following this consultation, the Council identified an additional option to be tested through the SA process (referred to as Option 10 in this document). This follows consideration of consultation responses which suggested that not all reasonable alternatives for the growth and spatial strategy had been assessed and that a high growth option which continued the current spatial strategy in the adopted Local Plan was missing.

This document provides a full record of all the spatial options tested and the findings of these options assessments, including the additional spatial option. Full details of the options tested are provided in Section 4 of this report and the 10 options are set out in Table 2.2.. A comparison between the Council’s initial preferred option (7b) and Option10 is then presented in Section 5.

This report does not constitute the formal SA report, however information presented at this stage is likely to be included within the final SA report which will accompany the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19).

² <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/>

There is potential for further options to be developed once the unmet need of Leicester is established and the redistribution of this unmet need is agreed by the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. Any further options will be assessed following the same method later on in the SA process if required/needed.

This report sets out:

- an Executive Summary of the interim findings of the assessment of the spatial options;
- the methodology used to assess the spatial options;
- the results from the assessment with more detail provided in Technical Appendices (see Appendix A);
- how the assessment informs the plan making process; and
- outlines the next steps of the SA process.

2 Background to the Spatial Options for Housing

2.1 Introduction

For the Local Plan review a number of 'reasonable alternatives' have been considered for the amount and distribution of housing land as part of the spatial strategy. This interim SA report presents the appraisal findings for housing distribution in the district which are referred to as 'spatial options' in this report. There is still uncertainty regarding the overall scale or amount of housing development which is needed due to Government's recent changes to the standard method for assessing housing need. This is due to the uncertainty regarding both the amount of unmet need from Leicester City and how this unmet need will then be redistributed amongst the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities.

Due to the uncertainty over future housing numbers to be planned for in the Local Plan review the SA has tested a range of scenarios, rather than a specific figure, for how any additional growth might be distributed across the district. These scenarios are summarised in Table 2.1 below and show the range of potential alternative figures (i.e., numbers of dwellings) to be taken forward as agreed at the Council's Local Plan Committee of 31 March 2021 as well as what the shortfall is for the High 1 and High 2 scenarios (as for both the low and medium scenarios no additional provision would be required).

Table 2.1 Summary of Housing Growth Scenarios (*the figures in italics are the additional needs over existing commitments)

Scenario	Annual Amount of dwellings	Source/Method	Total Requirement 2020-39	Total projected provision	(Shortfall)/over provision
Low	368	Standard Method (2020)	6,992	8,784 ³	1,792
Medium	448	HEDNA (2017)	8,512	8,784	272
High 1	512 (<i>1,000*</i>)	Strategic Growth Plan	9,728	8,784	(944)
High 2	730 (<i>5,100*</i>)	2018 based household projections	13,870	8,784	(5,086)

Of the following scenarios to be tested, the low and the medium scenarios (referred to as Option 1 in this report) are capable of being met through provision of existing commitments (developments with planning permission or resolution to grant permission or an allocation in the

³ Based on April 2020 housing trajectory showing completions of 6,652 for 2020-31 and assuming that 2,132 dwellings remaining on a number of sites are completed by 2039

adopted Local Plan). It is therefore not necessary to consider how these scenarios could be distributed across the district as they are already committed or allocated within the adopted Local Plan.

The High 1 scenario based on the outcome of the Strategic Growth Plan is the lower growth scenario with an allocation of 1,000 dwellings and the High 2 scenario has an allocation of 5,100 dwellings based on the 2018 based household projections published by the Office for National Statistics. The High 1 and the High 2 scenarios have been assessed against potential distribution options across the district based on the settlement hierarchy as per the adopted Local Plan, as set out below. These present the reasonable alternatives for the spatial distribution of housing across the district.

- Principal Town (PT) – Coalville
- Key Service Centres (KSC) – Ashby de la Zouch (ADLZ) and Castle Donington (CD)
- Local Service Centres (LSC) – Ibstock, Kegworth and Measham
- Sustainable Villages – 17 villages
- Small Villages

In addition to the current settlement hierarchy, the Strategic Growth Plan (SGP) also identified an area known as the Leicestershire International Gateway (the Gateway) as one of a number of areas for growth across Leicester and Leicestershire. There is not a specific defined boundary in the SGP but it *“is focused around the northern parts of the A42 and the M1”* and so includes the northern part of North West Leicestershire and Charnwood. For the purposes of this assessment the Gateway is not regarded as a settlement category but rather as a potential spatial distribution option and policy influencer. .

The Council’s Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) of 2019 includes the identification of 3 large scale sites in the vicinity of East Midlands Airport and Castle Donington (i.e. in the area of the Gateway). One of these sites located to the west of Castle Donington was promoted for about 1,400 dwellings. As it adjoins the existing limit of Castle Donington this site was considered to represent an extension to Castle Donington. The two other sites are located south of the airport and adjoin each other and were separately proposed as potential new settlements of 2,400 and 2,340 dwellings respectively. Subsequently, the two site promoters agreed to work together to promote a single new settlement. As this site is clearly a standalone development promoted as a new settlement this is referred to in this report as *‘New Settlement SW of East Midlands Airport’*.

A further potential new settlement to the south of the A42 was identified to the Council, although it was not submitted as part of the SHELAA. As a result of an assessment commissioned by the Council regarding the potential infrastructure issues of the four sites referred to (i.e. west of castle Donington, south of the airport (initially two sites) and the site south of the A42), this site was no longer considered to be reasonable alternative and so was not taken forward at this stage.

The Council used a number of assumptions to guide the choice of what are ‘reasonable alternatives’ as follows and which the assessment has been based on:

- Development should be dispersed around the district, rather than concentrating in only one category of settlement;
- There needs to be some development in the Principal Town (i.e. Coalville);
- There cannot be growth in a lower order settlement category if there is none in the higher order category (i.e. if no growth in Key Service Centre then not appropriate to direct development to Local Service Centre);
- Development in any category must be theoretically achievable as a result of the identification of potential development sites in the SHELAA (the issue of deliverability of individual sites would be a matter for later consideration).

2.2 The Options (‘Reasonable Alternatives’)

Following consideration of the four growth scenarios and the current settlement hierarchy including the ‘new settlement’ category, ten spatial distribution options were identified as shown in Table 2.2 below. As described in Section 1.3, Option 10 followed after the consultation on the initial 9 Options identified by the Council. For all the options the principle was to focus proportionally more growth in the higher order settlements (i.e. Principal Town, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres) or for Option 8 where growth is capable of being more sustainable i.e. a new settlement.

Table 2.2: Summary of Spatial Distribution Options

Option No	Spatial Distribution Area Description
Low and Medium scenario	
Option 1	Baseline Option (Continuation of adopted Local Plan)
High 1 and High 2 scenarios	
Option 2	Principal Town (Coalville) and Key Service Centres (KSC) (Castle Donington and Ashby de la Zouch)
Option 3	Principal Town and Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres (LSC)
Option 4	Principal Town and New Settlement
Option 5	Principal Town, New Settlement and KSC
Option 6	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC and LSC

Option 7	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC, LSC and Sustainable Villages
Option 9	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC, LSC, Sustainable Villages and Small Villages
High 2 scenario	
Option 8	New Settlement
Option 10	Principal Town, KSC, LSC and Sustainable Villages

Option 1 referred to as the Baseline Option is described ‘as per the adopted Local Plan’ i.e. the current spatial strategy within the adopted Local Plan which includes existing commitments in the plan but excludes any new development.

Option 1 has been tested as a separate option against the low and medium growth scenarios as both scenarios are capable of being met through provision from existing commitments in the adopted Local Plan. As this option is not allocating anything new in terms of spatial distribution there is no change to the baseline as set out in the adopted Local Plan which is why this option has not been tested against the other, higher distribution options.

Option 1 as per all the options, has been assessed without mitigation at this stage as it is not yet known what planning policies will be in place to mitigate any negative scores. Therefore, all options are tested without mitigation at this stage.

Options 2-7 and Option 9 have been assessed against two of the four growth scenarios (High 1 (a) and High 2 (b)) so comparisons can be drawn between the options as part of the assessment process.

Option 8 is only considered against the High 2 growth scenario as the High 1 growth scenario will not be viable for this distribution option as a site of 1,000 dwellings would not be able to deliver on-site infrastructure and supporting facilities.

Option 10 is only considered against the High 2 growth scenario. By the time that the Council decided to assess this further option there was greater clarity regarding the likely future housing requirement following the publication on a Statement of Common Ground with the other Leicester and Leicestershire authorities on housing provision. This identified a level of housing growth that was within the range of High 1 and High 2, but much closer to the High 2 scenario. Therefore, when considering Option 10 it was considered that it was only necessary to assess this against the High 2 growth scenario as it was clear that the High1 growth scenario was no longer appropriate. However, to be consistent with the assessment of the other options and to enable a direct comparison between the options, the amount of development was kept at High 2 rather than introducing a further growth scenario based on 686 dwellings each year.

In summary a total of seventeen spatial options have been assessed (taking into account the different growth scenarios) as reasonable alternatives for growth in the district. These are presented in Table 2.3 below.

The detailed assessment findings of each option are presented in excel tables in Appendix A.

A summary of the assessment findings is presented in Section 4 of this report.

Table 2.3: The Sixteen Spatial Options

Option No	Description
Low and Medium scenario (368-448 dwellings)	
Option 1	Baseline Option (Continuation of adopted Local Plan)
High 1 scenario (1,000 dwellings)	
Option 2a	Principal Town (Coalville) and Key Service Centres (KSC) (Castle Donington and Ashby de la Zouch)
Option 3a	Principal Town and Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres (LSC)
Option 4a	Principal Town and New Settlement
Option 5a	Principal Town, New Settlement and KSC
Option 6a	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC and LSC
Option 7a	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC, LSC and Sustainable Villages
Option 9a	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC, LSC, Sustainable Villages and Small Villages
New Settlement (5,100 dwellings)	
Option 8	New Settlement
High 2 scenario (5,100 dwellings)	
Option 2b	Principal Town (Coalville) and Key Service Centres (KSC) Castle Donington and Ashby de la Zouch)
Option 3b	Principal Town and Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres (LSC)
Option 4b	Principal Town and New Settlement
Option 5b	Principal Town, New Settlement and KSC
Option 6b	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC and LSC
Option 7b	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC, LSC and Sustainable Villages

Option 9b	Principal Town, New Settlement, KSC, LSC, Sustainable Villages and Small Villages
Option 10	Principal Town, KSC, LSC and Sustainable Villages

3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This section sets out the methodology used to assess the spatial options described in Section 2 of this report. This assessment will help to inform the Council's decision-making process regarding which of the spatial options to take forward in the next stage of preparation of the Local Plan review. Options for potential site allocations and policy alternatives will follow the spatial options assessment. Other spatial options could also be assessed using the method set out below if new reasonable alternatives were to be identified later in the plan-making process.

A clear method has been used for the assessment of all spatial options, to ensure all reasonable alternatives are assessed to the same level of detail and on a consistent basis. The appraisal of spatial options at this stage in the plan-making process is strategic and does not refer to specific sites or spatial locations (except with regards to the New Settlement) and is therefore at a high level.

The SA of the spatial options is a high-level assessment at this stage and has focused on identifying the likely sustainability effects of the spatial options as much as it is possible at this stage and which potential options have potential significant positive or negative effects and which are uncertain. It may be possible to mitigate some of the negative effects at a later more detailed stage in the SA process and this will be considered as the options become more detailed and refined. Similarly, it is not possible for the appraisal of strategic spatial options to assess the potential for cumulative effects in full at this stage, we have only provided this at a high-level for this assessment. Potential cumulative effects will be assessed for the appraisal of site options.

The SA objectives set out in the SA Framework developed earlier on in the SA process for the Scoping Report were used in the assessment of the options. The SA Framework is presented in Appendix B.

As stated in Section 2.2, all options have been tested without mitigation at this high level stage.

3.2 GIS and RAG rating

Prior to the formal assessment of each Spatial Option, an ArcGIS Pro map was set up with various GIS evidence layers. The data was then used to form Red Amber Green (RAG) criteria per SA objective, as provided in Table 3.1 below. In some instances, the same layer of GIS data has been used for multiple objectives.

For some SA objectives, no specific GIS data was available; rather a judgement was made as to whether the option would cause growth in particular geographical areas, such as urban areas as

well as consideration in regard to the district's settlement categories. Where GIS was not available or suitable to be used to inform the assessment against an SA Objective, this is indicated within Table 3.1.

All options which were spatially assessable then underwent a RAG assessment, with highly constrained options being allocated a red RAG rating, and those with few constraints a green RAG rating. This provided concise and objective information on which to base the next stage of the assessment.

Table 3.1: RAG Assessment Criteria

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
SA1 Improve the health and wellbeing of the District's population.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable people to make healthy choices through the use of urban design and provision of open space and walking / cycling routes. • Ensure everyone has access to natural green space and recreation facilities 		<p>Growth focused in areas with multiple GP surgeries</p> <p>Some growth in areas with existing facilities</p> <p>Growth focused away from locations with existing facilities.</p>
		Access to formal recreation space	<p>Growth focused in areas with multiple recreation facilities</p> <p>Some growth in areas with existing facilities</p> <p>Growth focused away from locations with existing facilities.</p>
		Access to informal recreation space	<p>Growth focused away from locations with existing facilities.</p>
SA2 Reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunities for all residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all residents have equitable access to health services, taking into account the needs of an aging population. • Ensure all residents have equitable access to education, employment, community services and facilities. • Help ensure all children have access to a local school. 	Number & location of GP practices	<p>Growth focused in areas with lots of GP surgeries</p> <p>Some growth in areas with existing facilities</p> <p>Growth focused away from locations with existing facilities.</p>
		Access to formal recreation space	<p>Growth focused in areas with lots of recreation facilities</p> <p>Some growth in areas with existing facilities</p> <p>Growth focused away from locations with existing facilities.</p>
		Access to informal recreation space	<p>Growth focused away from locations with existing facilities.</p>
		Primary & secondary schools	

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
		Primary & secondary school capacity	<p>Growth focused in areas with lots of education provision</p> <p>Some growth in areas with existing schools</p> <p>Growth focused away from locations with existing schools.</p>
		Access to employment areas	<p>Growth focused in areas with good employment access</p> <p>Growth in areas with some employment</p> <p>Growth focused away from areas with employment opportunities.</p>
		Town/local centre	<p>Growth focused in existing urban areas (i.e. PT, KSC and LSC as per the settlement hierarchy categories)</p> <p>Growth in sustainable village areas</p> <p>Growth focused in rural areas (i.e. small villages)</p>
<p>SA3 Help create the conditions for communities to thrive.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure an integrated approach to delivery of housing and community facilities. • Protect existing community facilities and ensure new facilities are built to support the needs of new housing development. • Help improve provision of local services, such as shops, GPs, public transport, and community service provision in the villages of northern NWL. • Provide opportunities for residents to mix and meet. • Help design out crime from new development. 	<p>Not spatially assessable in the RAG assessment, therefore a professional judgement has been made which considered each of the spatial options against each of the sub-objectives. This SA Objective will be assessed in a greater detail at the site assessments stage where appropriate.</p>	

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan for the district in the context of the wider region, including nearby areas of Leicestershire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire. 		
SA4 Provide good quality homes that meet local needs in terms of number, type and tenure in locations where it can deliver the greatest benefits and sustainable access to services and jobs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure a sufficient number of dwellings are provided to meet the needs of existing residents changing household size; to reduce commuting, improve access to services and jobs and to match employment growth. Provide affordable homes of the tenure and size to meet the needs of each part of the District. Provide market homes to meet needs and to match the economic growth aspirations of the wider area. Provide homes that meet the lifetime needs of residents. 	Basemap	<p>Growth focused away from PT, KSCs and LSCs, or new settlement created</p> <p>Growth dispersed across entire district</p> <p>Growth entirely in PT, KSCs and LSCs</p>
SA5 Support economic growth throughout the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for employment developments which support existing well performing employment sectors, such as storage and distribution and growth sectors including high tech manufacturing and which take advantage of the district's unique location. Support initiatives to improve the tourism and leisure sector, in particular in the National Forest and Charnwood Regional Forest Park. Protect key existing employment sites from change of use, especially where they support local employment needs. Support and help protect the rural economy. Support low carbon industries. 	Not spatially assessable in the RAG assessment.	

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
SA6 Enhance the vitality and viability of existing town centres and village centres.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance footfall within town centres and village centres. Support existing and new services and facilities (e.g. retail, restaurants etc.) within town centres and village centres. 	Basemap	<p>Development focused in urban areas (i.e. PT, KSC and LSCs as per the settlement hierarchy categories)</p> <p>Development distributed across the entire district</p> <p>Development focused in rural areas (i.e. small villages)</p>
SA7 Provision of a diverse range of employment opportunities that match the skills and needs of local residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support new employment growth in all areas, including rural locations, where it will help meet a local employment need. Maintain a diverse employment base, including growing the high skill job sector as well as lower skilled jobs to match the diverse job needs of the workforce. 	Not spatially assessable in the RAG assessment. This SA Objective will be assessed in the site assessments where appropriate. Strategic options cover housing growth and distribution only	
SA8 Reduce the need to travel and increase numbers of people walking, cycling or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure new development has sustainable transport access to facilities, services and jobs; Give priority to walkers and cyclists over car users. Increase cycle use for commuting and access to services, creating direct cycle routes. Reduce congestion in locations where it impacts on road safety, local amenity, causes severance, or adversely impacts on the economy. Use development to help secure better public transport for the District, in particular links to nearby rail stations and East Midlands Airport and evening and weekend services. 	Basemap HS2 & Existing rail links	<p>Growth focused in rural areas, with poor public transport links</p> <p>Growth in areas with some public transport links</p> <p>Growth will be focused in areas with good links to multiple modes of sustainable transport.</p>

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
SA9 Reduce air, light and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure new and existing communities are not adversely affected by poor quality air and noise pollution, either through their location or through causing a further deterioration as a result of new development. Avoid exacerbating light pollution and biodiversity impacts by keeping external lighting to the minimum required for safety and security. Ensure natural systems are not affected by air pollution. 	AQMA	<p>Growth focused in existing AQMAs</p> <p>Growth focused in areas close to AQMAs</p> <p>Growth will be focused away from existing AQMAs</p>
		Light pollution map	<p>Growth focused in existing high light pollution areas OR</p> <p>High growth focused in dark sky areas</p> <p>Growth will be focused in areas with low-medium levels of light pollution</p>
		Noise pollution map	<p>Growth focused in existing high noise pollution areas OR</p> <p>High growth focused in very quiet rural areas</p> <p>Growth will be focused in areas with low-medium levels of noise pollution</p>
SA10 Reduce carbon emissions throughout the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposals for decentralised (i.e. small and micro renewables) and low carbon energy generation. Support large scale low carbon grid schemes where appropriately located. All new development should be built to energy efficiency standards in accordance with national policies. Ensure new development and car parks provide EV charging points. 	Not spatially assessable in the RAG assessment. This SA Objective will be assessed in the site assessments where appropriate.	

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
SA11 Ensure the District is resilient to the impacts of climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow the sequential test in Planning Practice Guidance in the allocation of sites in flood risk areas. Ensure new development does not exacerbate the risk of flood off-site, for instance through use of sustainable drainage. Ensure new development is designed and located to be resilient to the impacts of climate change e.g. hotter summers, wetter winters and more extreme weather events. Ensure new development contributes to Green Infrastructure within the District, where possible. 	Flood Risk	<p>Development focused in Flood Zones 2 &3</p> <p>Development partially within Flood risk zones 2 & 3</p> <p>Development away from flood zones 2 &3 areas</p>
SA12 Protect and enhance the District's biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that development results in a net gain in biodiversity and contribute to the achievement of BAP targets. Protect, restore and enhance sites (both statutory and non-statutory) designated for their nature conservation importance from adverse impacts of development, including the river Mease SAC and Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). Enhance access to the natural environment, including integrating greater biodiversity into urban areas. Avoid habitat fragmentation and extend ecological corridors. Protect geological designations from adverse impacts of development. Ensure the protection and enhancement of ecosystem services. 	SACs SSSIs LWS Ancient Woodlands New Charnwood Forest River Mease catchment RIGs National Forest	<p>Development focused in environmentally sensitive areas</p> <p>Development located partly within or adjacent to environmentally sensitive areas</p> <p>Development focused in urban areas, away from environmentally sensitive areas</p>

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
SA13 Conserve and enhance the quality of the District's landscape and townscape character.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance the character and distinctiveness of the District's landscape. Help implement objectives for the National Forest and the Charnwood Forest Regional Park. Enhance townscape character, particularly in Coalville Town Centre. Enhance the transition for urban to rural at the edge of towns and villages. Enhance the relationship between new and existing communities Built design should help in creating vibrant places, making those approaching on foot a priority. Help deliver built environment improvements through high quality design. 	Basemap	<p>Option could alter the current townscape/landscape across the district, with development focused in rural areas and new settlements created</p> <p>Option would largely be focused in existing urban areas, with some development in villages</p> <p>Option would focus all development into existing urban areas.</p>
SA14 Ensure land is used efficiently and effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage development on previously developed land. Whenever possible protect the best quality agricultural land. Encourage development at densities which are appropriate to the location and the local environment. Where land has the potential to be contaminated or is known to be contaminated ensure that suitable investigation and remediation is carried out to bring it back into use. Protect soil quality and avoid soil pollution. Avoid the loss of and enhance the natural capital assets of the District. 	Basemap	<p>Development focused in urban areas</p> <p>Development focused in rural areas</p> <p>Option would require new settlement creation</p>
		Agricultural land	<p>Development will be focused in agricultural land of excellent, very good or good to moderate land</p> <p>Development will be focused in poor and very poor agricultural land.</p> <p>Development will occur on mostly non-agricultural land.</p>
		Coal authority areas	<p>Option focuses development into high risk CA development areas</p> <p>Option focuses development into low risk areas</p>

Objectives	Sub-objectives	GIS layer	Criteria
SA15 Conserve and enhance the character, diversity and local distinctiveness of the District's built and historic heritage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and conserve heritage assets, buildings and their settings. Maintain and increase access to cultural heritage assets. Protect and enhance the local historic environment and ensure new development respects the character of the historic environment. Respect archaeological remains and protect or record according to guidance. 	NWL local heritage assets Listed buildings Historic gardens Conservation areas Ancient monuments	<p>Option focuses development into areas with high density of heritage assets</p> <p>Option focuses development into some areas with heritage assets</p> <p>Development is focused away from key heritage assets.</p>
SA16 Protect water resources and ensure they are used efficiently.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure developments are designed to a high level of water efficiency. Ensure all water resources are protected from pollution. Ensure that all water courses are achieving at least 'Good' ecological status. 	Not spatially assessable in the RAG assessment.	
SA17 Ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure new development incorporates space for waste sorting and storage to aid recycling. Encourage sustainable construction making use of recycled and recyclable building materials. Ensure the re-use of demolition waste. Ensure minerals deposits and sites allocated for waste management are not sterilised through inappropriately located development 	Mineral safeguarding zones	<p>Development focused in mineral safeguarding areas</p> <p>Some development in mineral safeguarding areas</p> <p>Development away from mineral safeguarding areas</p>

3.3 Spatial Options Assessment Criteria

The assessment of each Spatial Option was informed primarily by the RAG ratings which are the GIS constraints. The following SA objectives were screened out of the assessment, as they were not deemed to be spatially assessable using GIS at this high-level stage of assessment:

- SA5: Support economic growth throughout the District.
- SA7: Provision of a diverse range of employment opportunities that match the skills and needs of local residents.
- SA16: Protect water resources and ensure they are used efficiently.

All other SA objectives were assessed, with each potential effect identified allocated a significance score/symbol, which is colour coded, described and details of the nature of the potential effect (i.e. direct/indirect or cumulative) listed in Table 3.2 below. Potential significant and uncertain effects are within Section 4 of this report, and detailed results of the assessment are within Appendix A. Definitions of the descriptor used for potential effects are also detailed within Table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2: Significance definitions for Spatial Options assessment

Symbol	Definitions of Significance of Effects Against the SA Objectives	Assumptions on the nature of effects
++	<p>Significant Positive Effect: the policy supports the achievement of this objective; it addresses all relevant sub-objectives and could result in a potentially significant beneficial effect e.g. improved access by walking and cycling modes to a local or town centre</p>	<p>Permanent Continual Magnitude: High 80%+ receptor or environmental capacity affected; or Medium 40-80% of receptor or environmental capacity of affected The effect could be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance and redefine the location in a positive manner, making a contribution at a national or international scale; • enhance and redefine the location in a positive manner; • repair or restore receptors badly damaged or degraded through previous uses; and/or • improve one or more key elements/features/ characteristics of a receptor with recognised quality such as a specific regional or national designation.
+	<p>Minor Positive Effect: the policy supports the achievement of this objective; it addresses some relevant sub-objectives, although it may have only a minor beneficial effect</p>	<p>Reversible Infrequent or intermittent Magnitude: Low 20-40% of receptor or capacity affected. The size, nature and location of a proposed scheme would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improve undesignated yet recognised receptor qualities at the neighbourhood scale; • fit into or with the existing location and existing receptor qualities; and/or • enable the restoration of valued characteristic features partially lost through other land uses.
0	<p>Neutral Effect: the policy has no impact or effect and is neutral insofar as the benefits and drawbacks appear equal and neither is considered significant</p>	N/A
?	<p>Uncertain Effect: Uncertain or insufficient information on which to</p>	N/A

Symbol	Definitions of Significance of Effects Against the SA Objectives	Assumptions on the nature of effects
	determine the assessment at this stage	
-	Minor Negative Effect: the policy appears to conflict with the achievement of this objective; it does not address relevant sub-objectives and may result in minor adverse effects	Reversible Infrequent or intermittent Magnitude: Low 20-40% of receptor or capacity affected. The size, nature and location of a proposed scheme would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be out of scale with the location; or • leave an adverse impact on a receptor of recognised quality such as a specific district or county designation.
--	Significant Negative Effect: the policy works against the achievement of this objective; it could exacerbate relevant sub-objectives and may result in a potentially significant adverse effect e.g. loss of all or part of a designated ecological site of national importance.	Permanent Irreversible Continual Magnitude: High 80%+ receptor or environmental capacity affected; or Medium 40-80% of receptor or environmental capacity of affected The effect could be to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permanently degrade, diminish or destroy the integrity of the receptor; • cause a very high-quality receptor to be permanently changed and its quality diminished; • cannot be fully mitigated and may cumulatively amount to a severe adverse effect; • be at a considerable variance to the location, degrading the integrity of the receptor; and/or • will be substantially damaging to a high-quality receptor such as a specific regional or national designation.

4 Results of the Assessment of the Spatial Options

4.1 Introduction

This section sets out the results of the assessments of the Spatial Options. The detailed assessment findings of each option are presented in excel tables in Appendix A. Assumptions made for each option are also included within these excel tables.

Section 4.2 sets out the individual performance of each spatial option and then an overall summary of the performance of each option against the number of potential significant positive, significant negative and uncertain effects and consideration against the different growth scenarios is provided in Section 4.3. This will aid option development and selection going forward to the next detailed stage of the SA process.

4.2 Individual performance of each Spatial Option

Baseline Option

Option 1 – Low and Medium Scenarios

Option 1 would deliver both the lower growth and medium growth scenarios through provision from existing commitments in the adopted Local Plan. It is not allocating anything new in terms of spatial distribution so there is no change to the baseline as set out in the adopted Local Plan which is why this option has not been assessed against a 'High 1' or a 'High 2' scenario (a or b) as per the other options assessed.

The growth in this option would be dispersed between the different settlement categories: Coalville, Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres, Sustainable Villages and Small Villages as defined in the adopted Local Plan.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	+	+	--		++		?	--	+	0	0	++	?	?		?

Two potential significant positive effects have been identified in relation to SA6 (enhance town and village centres) and SA13 (conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character). For SA6 this is due to growth being dispersed across all settlement categories of higher and lower order and for SA13 the growth will be predominantly located in existing urban areas where there will be opportunities to enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the townscape and landscape through existing policies in the adopted Local Plan.

Two potential significant negative effects have been identified in relation to SA4 (to provide good quality homes) and SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution). For SA4, this option will not

deliver the additional growth based on the Strategic Growth Plan and 2018-based projections (High 1 and High 2 growth scenarios) which the other options are based on as it is based on the standard methodology required by national policy. In terms of SA9, development implemented through this option from existing commitments is likely to add to the existing air and noise issues potentially affecting the AQMA due to possible increases in congestion. There is also the potential effects from noise in relation to HS2 which could affect new and existing residents.

Five uncertain effects have been identified in relation to SA8 (reduce the need to travel), SA11 (resilience to climate change), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historical heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources and reduce waste generation). For SA8 there is uncertainty in relation to the delivery of the proposed road improvement scheme and in relation to SA11 as further assessment of flood risk is needed as some of the committed sites are yet to pass the Sequential Test (SFRA, 2015). For SA15, some of the allocations in this option are located in areas where there are a large number of heritage sites so the overall effects are uncertain at this stage. Similarly, an uncertain effect has been identified for SA17 due to the absence of the results of a mineral assessment which will need to be carried out for the development under this option which cover the mineral safeguarding area.

This baseline option is capable of being delivered through existing commitments but it will not meet the current housing need projections identified in the High 1 and High 2 growth scenarios.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town and Key Service Centres

Option 2a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 2a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and is based on the assumption that 60% (600 dwellings) of this residual requirement would go to the Principal Town of Coalville, and the other 40% (400 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres of Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	?	?	+		+		-	?	+	?	?	?	?	?		?

No potential significant positive or negative effects have been determined for Option 2a.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **nine uncertain effects** have been identified. These are in relation to SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunity for all residents), SA3 (help to create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution), SA11 (resilience to climate change), SA12 (to protect and enhance biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance), SA13 (conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character,

diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historical heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources and reduce waste generation).

The housing numbers for this option are expected to meet the minimum requirement using the standard method in the national planning guidance (6,395 dwellings).

This High 1 ‘lower growth’ scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category.

Option 2b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 2b would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments, and similar to Option 2a, Option 2b assumes that 60% (3,060 dwellings) of this residual requirement would go to the Principal Town of Coalville, and the other 40% (2,040 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres of Ashby de la Zouch and Castle Donington.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	--	?	+		+		-	?	+	?	?	?	?	?		?

No potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 2b.

One potential significant negative effect has been identified in regard to SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunity for all residents) because of the higher quantum for this option which is likely to put greater pressure on existing facilities such as schools and employment zones.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **eight uncertain effects** have been identified. These are in relation to SA3 (help to create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution), SA11 (resilience to climate change), SA12 (to protect and enhance biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance), SA13 (conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historical heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources and reduce waste generation).

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections but this growth is constrained to existing settlements compared with the options that include a new settlement.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town, Key Service Centres, and Local Service Centres

Option 3a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 3a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and is based on the assumption that 50% (500 dwellings) of this residual

requirement would go to the Principal Town, 30% (300 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres and 20% (200 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	-	?	+		+		--	?	+	-	?	?	?	?		?

No potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 3a.

One potential significant negative effect has been identified in regard to SA8 (to reduce the need to travel and increase the number of people walking, cycling, or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs). This due to public transport services being infrequent and there being fairly low levels of connectivity in the Local Service Centres, as well as lack of designated walkways and cycle paths linking settlements which may discourage sustainable travel.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **eight uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA1 (improve health and wellbeing), SA3 (help to create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution), SA12 (to protect and enhance biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance), SA13 (conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historical heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources and reduce waste generation).

This High 1 scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category. It will not however, meet the expected higher numbers of growth identified in the 2018 based projections (the High 2 scenario).

Option 3b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 3b would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and similar to Option 3a, Option 3b assumes that 50% (2,550 dwellings) of the residual requirement would go to the Principal Town, 30% (1,530 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres and 20% (1,020 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
--	--	?	+		+		--	?	+	-	?	?	?	?		?

No potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 3b.

Three potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 3b. SA1 (improve the health and wellbeing of the District’s population) has been identified as a potential significant negative due to the limited accessibility to active travel currently in the District. SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access to opportunities for all residents) is similarly potentially negative due to constraints around access to employment and capacity at education

sites, particularly in Local Service Centres at this higher quantum of development. SA8 (to reduce the need to travel and increase the number of people walking, cycling, or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs) has been identified as a potentially significant negative effect as public transport services are infrequent and have fairly low levels of connectivity in the Local Service Centres. There is also a lack of designated walkways and cycle paths linking settlements which may discourage sustainable travel.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **seven uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA3 (help to create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution), SA12 (to protect and enhance biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance), SA13 (conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historical heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources and reduce waste generation).

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections, but this growth is constrained to existing settlements compared with the options that include a new settlement.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town and to a New Settlement

Option 4a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 4a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and based on the assumption that 60% (600 dwellings) of this residual requirement would be directed to a New Settlement, identified to the South West of the East Midlands Airport, and the remaining 40% (400 dwellings) would be designated to the Principal Town.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
--	?	?	+		-		?	?	+	-	--	--	--	?		?

No potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 4a.

Four potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 4a in relation to: SA1 (improve the health and wellbeing of the District’s population) SA12 (to protect and enhance the District’s biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12), SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District’s landscape and townscape character), and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively). SA1 has been identified as a potentially significant negative effect, as accessibility to facilities is good in the Principal Town but possibly constrained in the New Settlement due to the scale of development not supporting the provision of new sustainable transport modes needed, and active travel links would need to be improved in both areas of the District. For SA12 and SA14 a New Settlement

would lead to permanent and irreversible loss of greenfield land which is currently classified as Good Quality Agricultural Land. A New Settlement also has the potential to have an indirect negative effects on Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland nearby (SA12), which may have adverse impacts on the current landscape character in small neighbouring villages nearby (SA13).

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **six uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunities for all residents), SA3 (help to create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA8 (reduce the need to travel and increase numbers of people walking, cycling, or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 1 scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category. It will not however, meet the expected higher numbers of growth identified in the 2018 based projections (the High 2 scenario).

Option 4b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 4b would need to deliver 5,100 new homes to the District over and above existing commitments and similar to Option 4a, Option 4b assumes that 60% (3,060 dwellings) of this residual requirement would go to a New Settlement, identified to the South West of the East Midlands Airport, and the remaining 40% (2,040 dwellings) to the Principal Town.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	--	?	+		-		--	?	+	-	--	--	--	?		?

No **potential significant positive effects** have been determined for Option 4b.

Five potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 4b in relation to reducing inequalities (SA2), reducing the need to travel (SA8), protecting and enhancing biodiversity (SA12), conserving and enhancing landscape and townscape (SA13) and efficient use of land (SA14). For SA2 and SA8 a potential significant negative has been identified due to the higher quantum of growth delivered through this option which is likely to put major constraints on existing education facilities and on the existing capacity issue along the A511 from J22 of the M1 to the east of Coalville. The Principal Town contains a number of SSSI, LNR sites and LWSs and the New Settlement also has the potential to have indirect negative effects on Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland nearby (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12).

Development from this option could also affect the urban edge and existing townscape / landscape and potentially leading to coalescence with smaller neighbouring villages (SA13). For SA14 there will also be a loss of greenfield land and ‘good quality’ agricultural land.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **five uncertain effects** have been identified under this option in relation to SA1 (health and wellbeing), SA3 (help to create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution), SA15 (conserve and enhance the built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 2 ‘ scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections and growth would not be constrained to existing settlements because this option also includes a new settlement.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town, New Settlement, and Key Service Centres

Option 5a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 5a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and is based on the assumption that 45% (450 dwellings) of growth would collectively go to both the Principal Town and the New Settlement option, and the remaining 10% (100 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	--	?	+		+		--	?	?	-	--	--	--	?		?

No **potential significant positive effects** have been determined for Option 5a.

Five potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 5a in relation to reducing inequalities (SA2), reducing the need to travel (SA8), protecting and enhancing biodiversity (SA12), conserving and enhancing landscape and townscape (SA13) and efficient use of land (SA14). For SA2 and SA8 a potential significant negative has been identified due to the growth delivered through this option due to the increase in demand and pressure this option will have on educational facilities and health services and in relation to the existing capacity issues along the A511 from J22 of the M1 to the east of Coalville. Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch are located within a National Forest which contains a number of SSSI, LNR sites and LWSs and the New Settlement also has the potential to have indirect negative effects on Local Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland nearby (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12). Development from this option could also affect the urban edge and existing townscape / landscape and potentially leading to coalescence with smaller neighbouring villages (SA13). For SA14 there will also be a loss of greenfield land and ‘good quality’ agricultural land.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **six uncertain effects** have been identified under this option in relation to SA1 (health and wellbeing), SA3 (help to create the

conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution), SA10 (reduce carbon emissions), SA15 (conserve and enhance the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 1 scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category including a new settlement. It will not however, meet the expected higher numbers of growth identified in the 2018 based projections (the High 2 scenario).

Option 5b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 5b would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments, and similar to Option 5a, Option 5b 45% (2,295 dwellings) of growth would collectively go to both the Principal Town and the New Settlement option, and the remaining 10% (510 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	--	?	+		+		--	?	?	--	--	--	--	?		?

No **potential significant positive effects** have been determined for Option 5b.

Six potential significant negative effects have been identified in relation to reducing inequalities (SA2), reducing the need to travel (SA8), climate change (SA11), protecting and enhancing biodiversity (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12), conserving and enhancing landscape and townscape (SA13) and efficient use of land (SA14). A potential significant negative effect has been identified for SA2 due to the likely increase in pressure on existing health and education services from this higher quantum of development in these settlements. For SA8 a potential significant negative has been identified due to the likely effect new development may have on existing capacity issues along the A511 from J22 of the M1 to the east of Coalville. Due to the higher level of growth in potential areas at risk of flooding, a potential significant negative effect has been identified for SA11.

Coalville and Ashby de la Zouch are located within a National Forest which contains a number of SSSI, LNR sites and LWSs and the New Settlement also has the potential to have indirect negative effects on LWSs and Ancient Woodland nearby (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12). Development from this option could also affect the urban edge and existing townscape / landscape and potentially leading to coalescence with smaller neighbouring villages (SA13). For SA14 there will also be a loss of greenfield land and ‘good quality’ agricultural land.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **five uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA3 (communities), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (reduce carbon emissions), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the

District's built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections and growth would not be constrained to existing settlements because this option also includes a new settlement.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town, New Settlement, Key Service Centres, and Local Service Centre

Option 6a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 6a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and is based on the assumption that 35% (350 dwellings) of growth would collectively go to both the Principal Town and the New Settlement, 20% (200 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres, and 10% (100 dwellings) would go to the Local Service Centres.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17
-	?	?	+		?		-	?	?	-	--	--	--	?		?

No potential significant positive effects have been determined for option 6a.

Three potential significant negative effects have been identified for SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District's landscape and townscape character), protecting and enhancing biodiversity (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively). For SA12 and SA14 there is unlikely to be the loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity and loss of 'good quality' agricultural land. For SA13, development may have adverse impacts on small neighbouring villages nearby and may create implications regarding coalescence. Overall, it may be possible for development to contribute to increasing biodiversity and green infrastructure, however, prior to mitigation, a potential significant negative effect is recorded.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **seven uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunities for all residents), SA3 (help create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA6 (enhance the vitality and viability of existing town centres and village centres), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (reduce carbon emissions), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District's built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 1 scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category

including a new settlement. It will not however, meet the expected higher numbers of growth identified in the 2018 based projections (the High 2 scenario).

Option 6b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 6b would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments, and similar to Option 6a, Option 6b assumes that over 35% (1,785 dwellings) of growth would go to both the Principal Town and the New Settlement, 20% (1,020 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres, and 10% (510 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	?	?	+		?		-	?	?	--	--	--	?	?		?

No potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 6b.

Three potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 6b for SA11 (climate change), protecting and enhancing biodiversity (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) and SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District’s landscape and townscape character). For SA12 there is unlikely to be the loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity and on ‘good quality’ agricultural land. For SA13, development may have adverse impacts on small neighbouring villages nearby and may create implications regarding coalescence (SA13). There is also the potential for areas in this option to be at risk of flooding due to the higher level of growth (SA11).

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **eight uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are in relation to SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunities for all residents), SA3 (help create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA6 (enhance the vitality and viability of existing town centres and village centres), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (reduce carbon emissions), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections and growth would not be constrained to existing settlements because this option also includes a new settlement.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town, New Settlement and Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages

Option 7a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 7a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and is based on the assumption that 35% (350 dwellings) of growth would go to both the Principal Town and the new settlement options, 15% (150 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres, 10% (100 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres and 5% (50 dwellings) to Sustainable Villages.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	?	?	++		++		-	?	?	-	--	--	?	?		?

Two potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 7a. SA4 (good quality homes to meet local needs) has been identified as a potential significant positive due to this option dispersing development across the entire District rather than in a limited number of locations, ensuring that there is an increase in the number and mix of housing whilst also providing an element of affordable housing to meet the needs of the population. SA6 (enhance the vitality and viability of existing town and village centres) has also been identified as a potential significant positive as development under this option should help to maintain and enhance current existing urban areas, support existing services, and encourage the development of new ones.

Two potential significant negative effect have been identified for Option 7a relating to protecting and enhancing biodiversity (SA12) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) and SA13 (conserve and enhance landscape). For SA12 there is unlikely to be the loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity. For SA13 this is due to the overall effect of a new settlement on the existing landscape as well as development also being spread across more rural areas.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, eight uncertain effects have been identified under this option. These are SA1 (improve the health and wellbeing of the District’s population), SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunities for all residents), SA3 (help create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (reduce carbon emissions), SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 1 scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category

including a new settlement. It will not however, meet the expected higher numbers of growth identified in the 2018 based projections (the High 2 scenario).

Option 7b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 7b would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments, and similar to Option 7a, Option 7b assumes that 35% (1785 dwellings) of growth would go to both the Principal Town and the new settlement options, 15% (765 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres, 10% (510 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres and 5% (255 dwellings) to Sustainable Villages.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	--	?	++		++		-	?	?	--	--	--	--	?		?

Two potential significant positive effects have been determined for Option 7b. SA4 (good quality homes to meet local needs) has been identified as a potential significant positive as under this option development is spread across the entire District rather than in a limited number of locations, ensuring that there is an increase in the number and mix of housing whilst also providing an element of affordable housing to meet the needs of the population, particularly at this higher quantum of growth. SA6 (enhance the vitality and viability of existing town and village centres) has also been identified as a potential significant positive as development under this option should help to maintain and enhance current existing urban areas, support existing services, and encourage the development of new ones.

Five potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 7b. SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair and equal access and opportunity for all residents) is identified as a potential significant negative effect as this quantum of growth could lead to development occurring in areas which are not well provisioned with education and/or healthcare facilities, or where they may not be able to expand. For SA11 (climate change) a potential significant negative effect has been identified due to the higher level of growth potentially resulting in development in potential areas at risk of flooding. For SA12 (protecting and enhancing biodiversity) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) there is unlikely to be the loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity. SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District’s landscape and townscape character), and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) have all been determined as potential significant negatives, as the New Settlement would lead to permanent and irreversible loss of greenfield land and Agricultural Land. Development may also have adverse impacts on small neighbouring villages nearby and may create implications regarding coalescence (SA13).

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **five uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA3 (help create the conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect

human health), SA10 (reduce carbon emissions), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure the efficient use of natural resources, including reducing waste generation).

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections and growth would not be constrained to existing settlements because this option also includes a new settlement.

Growth allocated to a New Settlement

Option 8 – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 8 would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District, all of which would be located in a New Settlement to the South West of the East Midlands Airport.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	++	++	+		--		++	?	+	-	--	--	--	?		+

Three potential significant positive effects have been identified for Option 8. For SA2 (reduce inequalities) the creation of a new settlement, with a new primary school, employment space and local centre provided on site, would help ensure access and opportunities for to give opportunities to future residents to access education, employment, community services and facilities. A local centre should also be developed within the new settlement. SA3 (help create the conditions for communities to thrive) has been identified as a potential significant positive effect as under this option development is focussed in one location where new services can be developed and accessibility routes e.g. cycle paths can be built into the design. SA8 (reduce the need to travel and increase the number of people walking, cycling, or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs) has also been identified as a potential significant positive effect when considered in the long term as development under this option is likely to be accompanied by the development of sustainable travel links including both public transport and cycle networks.

Four potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 8. For SA6 (enhance existing town and village centres) this option would create an entirely new settlement with its own local centre and facilities which is not connected to existing towns or Key Service centres. It is unlikely therefore to enhance or benefit existing town centres and village centres. For SA12 (protecting and enhancing biodiversity) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) there will be no loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity. It is also considered to have a potential significant negative effect on SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) as the New Settlement would lead to permanent and irreversible loss of greenfield land and ‘good quality’ agricultural land. The new development may also have adverse effects on small neighbouring

villages nearby by significantly altering the character of the area SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District’s landscape and townscape character).

Three uncertain effects have been identified under this option. These are SA1 (improve the health and wellbeing of the District’s population), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), and SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage). For SA1 it is unclear if formal recreation or healthcare facilities will be provided on site and it is unclear if existing healthcare facilities in neighbouring areas have capacity for an increase in numbers, hence an uncertain effect has been recorded. The new settlement will be located on land near to East Midlands Airport and Donnington Race track therefore residents could be adversely affected by high levels of noise and air pollution. This could be mitigated through design of the development but this level of detail is unknown at this stage (SA9). Similarly, an uncertain effect has been recorded for SA15 until further details of the design of development are known.

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections and growth would be entirely within a new settlement area.

Growth allocated to rural settlements including Sustainable Villages, Small Villages, and a New Settlement.

Option 9a – High 1 (1,000) Scenario

Option 9a would need to deliver 1,000 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments and is based on the assumption that 20% (200 dwellings) of this residual requirement would go to the Principal Town of Coalville, 35% (350 dwellings) to the New Settlement 9% (90 dwellings) to Key Service Centres, 5% (50 dwellings) to Local Service Centres, 27% (270 dwellings) to Sustainable Villages and 4% (40 dwellings) to Small Villages.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	--	?	++		-		-	?	?	-	--	--	--	?		?

One potential significant positive effect has been determined for Option 9a regarding SA4 (provide good quality homes to meet local needs) as the development in this option will occur across all existing settlement types, as well as within a new settlement area. This should provide a significant number, mix, and proportion of affordable housing across the District.

Four potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 9a. SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair access and opportunity for all residents) has been proposed as a potential significant negative as development is focussed in rural areas where access to education, employment, and services is limited, and due to the distribution of growth it is unlikely that new services would be provided. For SA12 (protecting and enhancing biodiversity) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) there is unlikely to be the loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the

development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity. SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District’s landscape and townscape character), and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) have all been determined as potential significant negatives, as the New Settlement would lead to permanent and irreversible loss of greenfield land and agricultural land. Development may also have negative effects on small neighbouring villages nearby by significantly altering the character of the area (SA13).

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **six uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA1 (improve the health and wellbeing of the District’s population), SA3 (create conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (carbon emissions), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure efficient use of natural resources including waste generation).

This High 1 scenario based on the Strategic Growth Plan projections is capable of being delivered due to the lower amount of growth being dispersed across more than one settlement category including a new settlement. It will not however, meet the expected higher numbers of growth identified in the 2018 based projections (the High 2 scenario).

Option 9b – High 2 (5,100) Scenario

Option 9b would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments, and similar to Option 9a, Option 9b assumes that 20% (1,020 dwellings) of this residual requirement would go to the Principal Town of Coalville, and 35% (1,785 dwellings) to the New Settlement, 9% (459 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres, 5% (255 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres, 27% (1,377 dwellings) to Sustainable Villages and 4% (204 dwellings) to Small Villages.

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
?	--	?	++		-		-	?	?	--	--	--	--	?		?

One potential significant positive effect has been determined for Option 9b regarding SA4 (provide good quality homes to meet local needs) as development within this option will occur across all existing settlement types, as well as within a new settlement area. This should provide a significant number, mix, and proportion of affordable housing across the District.

Five potential significant negative effects have been identified for Option 9b. SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair access and opportunity for all residents) has been identified as a potential significant negative effect as development is focussed in rural areas where access to education, employment, and services is limited, and due to the distribution of growth it is unlikely that new services would be provided. This issue may further be exacerbated by the higher quantum of growth. For SA11 (climate change) a potential significant negative effect has been

identified due to the likely higher level of growth in potential areas at risk of flooding. For SA12 (protecting and enhancing biodiversity) (as per Options 4-9 a potential negative cumulative effect has been identified in relation to SA12) there is unlikely to be the loss of protected areas for nature conservation or geological interest but the development on greenfield land has the potential to result in significant negative effects on biodiversity. SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District’s landscape and townscape character), and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) have all been determined as potential significant negative effects, as the New Settlement would lead to permanent and irreversible loss of greenfield land and agricultural land. Development may also have negative effects on small neighbouring villages nearby by significantly altering the character of the area (SA13).

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **six uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. These are SA1 (improve the health and wellbeing of the District’s population), SA3 (create conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (carbon emissions), SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District’s built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure efficient use of natural resources including waste generation).

This High 2 scenario is expected to meet the identified need set out in the 2018-based household projections and growth would not be constrained to existing settlements because this option also includes a new settlement.

Growth allocated to the Principal Town, Key Service Centres, Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages

Option 10 - High 2 (5,100) Scenario

SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA 10	SA 11	SA 12	SA 13	SA 14	SA 15	SA 16	SA 17
-	--	?	++		++		--	?	?	--	--	?	?	?		?

Option 10 would need to deliver 5,100 new dwellings in the District over and above existing commitments, and assumes that 40% (2,056 dwellings) of this residual requirement would go to the Principal Town of Coalville, and 35% (1,741 dwellings) to the Key Service Centres, 15% (771 dwellings) to the Local Service Centres, 10% (532 dwellings) to Sustainable Villages).

A potential significant positive effect has been identified in relation to SA4 (good quality homes to meet local needs), as development within this option will occur across all existing settlement types. This should provide a significant number, mix, and proportion of affordable housing across the District. Similarly, **a potential significant positive effect** has been identified in relation to SA6 (enhance existing town and village centres), as development under this option should help

to maintain and enhance current existing urban areas, support existing services, and encourage the development of new ones.

Four potential significant negative effects have been identified for SA2 (reduce inequalities and ensure fair access and opportunity for all residents), SA8 (reduce the need to travel and increase the number of people walking, cycling, or using the bus for their day-to-day travel needs) and SA11 (climate change) and SA12 (protecting and enhancing biodiversity). Under this option a significant amount of the additional growth would be directed towards the Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages, where existing access to healthcare and education are already limited. Sustainable transport modes are also known to be limited across the District and there are issues regarding public transport in the Local Service Centres and Sustainable Villages, where development will be directed by this option. For SA11 a potential significant negative effect has been identified due to the likely higher level of growth in potential areas at risk of flooding. For SA12 a potential significant negative effect has been identified due to some development in this option being located in or near to environmental sensitive areas.

Due to the unknown location and quantum of development sites, **seven uncertain effects** have been identified under this option. SA3 (create conditions for communities to thrive), SA9 (reduce air, light, and noise pollution to avoid damage to natural systems and protect human health), SA10 (carbon emissions), (conserve and enhance the quality of the District's landscape and townscape character), and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District's built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure efficient use of natural resources including waste generation).

5 Comparison Assessment of Option 7b and Option 10

5.1 Introduction

Following the SA of the initial Spatial Options and subsequent consultation by the Council an additional option (Option 10) was identified and assessed under the SA process. This section provides a summary of comparisons drawn between this new option and the Council's initial preferred option (Option 7b).

5.2 Comparison

From the assessment findings the following conclusions have been drawn from comparison of the initial preferred option (Option 7b) with Option 10:

- A higher number of potential significant negative effects in relation to SA objectives SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District's landscape and townscape character) and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) were recorded for Option 7b due to 1,785 dwellings being located in a New Settlement rather than within an existing settlement area;
- Both options include development in Sustainable Villages however, Option 10 performs more negatively for SA8 (accessibility) as it will direct a higher level of growth (532 dwellings) to Sustainable Villages compared to Option 7b (255 dwellings) and with this higher quantum of new residents there is likely to be a greater negative effect on road traffic due to an increase in need for private vehicles;
- Both options perform positively for SA4 (good quality homes to meet local need), and SA6 (enhance the vitality and viability of existing town and village centres);
- Seven uncertain effects were recorded for Option 10 compared to five for Option 7b. The differences related to SA objectives SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District's landscape and townscape character) and SA14 (ensure land is used efficiently and effectively) whereby Option 7b scored potential significant negative for SA13 and SA14. This is because Option 7b includes the creation of a New Settlement so there is more certainty of the potential effects on these SA objectives. With Option 10 these effects are more difficult to define until the detailed location of new housing development is known.

6 Overall performance of the Spatial Options

Table 6.1 below presents the overall performance of all options.

Table 6.1: Summary of the assessments

	Health	Inequalities	Communities	Housing	Economy	Town centres	Employment	Sustainable travel	Light/air/ noise	Carbon Emissions	Climate change	Bio/geodiversity	Landscape/ Townscape	Land use	Heritage assets	Water resources	Natural resources
	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17
Low and medium scenario																	
Option 1	-	+	+	--		++		?	--	+	?0	0	++	?	?		?
High 1 scenario																	
Option 2a	-	?	?	+		+		-	?	+	?	?	?	?	?		?
Option 3a	?	-	?	+		+		--	?	+	-	?	?	?	?		?
Option 4a	--	?	?	+		-		?	?	+	-	--	--	--	?		?
Option 5a	?	--	?	+		+		--	?	?	-	--	--	--	?		?
Option 6a	-	?	?	+		?		-	?	?	-	--	--	--	?		?
Option 7a	?	?	?	++		++		-	?	?	-	--	--	?	?		?
Option 9a	?	--	?	++		-		-	?	?	-	--	--	--	?		?
High 2 Scenario																	
Option 2b	-	--	?	+		+		-	?	+	?	?	?	?	?		?
Option 3b	--	--	?	+		+		--	?	+	-	?	?	?	?		?
Option 4b	?	--	?	+		-		--	?	+	-	--	--	--	?		?

	Health	Inequalities	Communities	Housing	Economy	Town centres	Employment	Sustainable travel	Light/air/ noise	Carbon Emissions	Climate change	Bio/geodiversity	Landscape/ Townscape	Land use	Heritage assets	Water resources	Natural resources
	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17
Option 5b	-	--	?	+		+		--	?	?	--	--	--	--	?		?
Option 6b	-	?	?	+		?		-	?	?	--	--	--	?	?		?
Option 7b	-	--	?	++		++		-	?	?	--	--	--	--	?		?
Option 8	?	++	++	+		--		++	?	+	-		--	--	?		+
Option 9b	?	--	?	++		-		-	?	?	--	--	--	--	?		?
Option 10	-	--	?	++		++		--	?	?	--	--	?	?	?		?

As seen in Table 4.1 above, there was some uncertainty within the assessment of all options, due to the high-level nature of the assessments. When further details of the sites available and quantum of development are determined, it may be possible to address some uncertain effects. However, even with this level of uncertainty some general trends were noted and are detailed below.

Generally, all options except Option 1 (as per the local plan) have performed positively in relation to SA4 (good quality homes to meet local need), as they will aid in the delivery of housing to meet local needs. In particular, Options 7a, 7b, 9a, 9b and 10 will deliver housing throughout all areas of the District. Those options which deliver greater levels of housing are likely to further enhance this potential positive effect.

SA6 (enhance the vitality and viability of existing town and village centres) has generally scored positively for options which focus development into existing town and village centres, as this is expected to help increase footfall and subsequently vitality of the areas. The exceptions for this are Option 8, which focusses development into a single new settlement area and Options 9a and 9b, which allow for development to occur in some rural settlements.

It is also noted that options which focus development into already urbanised town centre and key service centre areas (Options 1 to 4b) have been recorded as having potential for a positive effect on SA10 (reduce carbon emissions). This is due to there being greater opportunities in urban areas for potential development to be located near to significant waste heat sources, which could be used in district heating networks, particularly on larger sites.

In contrast, Options 4a-9b, which encourage development across the District, including within a new settlement, have been identified as options with potential for greater adverse negative effects on SA13 (conserve and enhance the quality of the District's landscape and townscape character). This is due to higher proportions of development being directed into a new settlement area and the rural areas of the district

As described in Section 2.1, Option 8 (*'New Settlement SW of East Midlands Airport'*) would create a new settlement within the District and focus all development into a single location. There is therefore a disparity between the performance of this option and most other options, as there is potential to cluster future infrastructure need (and as a consequence, development of required services) into a single area. There are some Local Wildlife Sites and one Ancient Woodland site located near to the potential new settlement which may experience indirect negative effects from development on SA12 (to protect and enhance the District's biodiversity and protect areas identified for their nature conservation and geological importance). The development of 5,100 homes in this area of the District could also increase recreational pressure, which could degrade current sensitive biological and geodiversity receptors. Hence, a potential significant negative effect has been identified for this option in relation to SA12.

Uncertainty has been recorded in the assessment of most options for SA15 (conserve and enhance the character, diversity, and local distinctiveness of the District's built and historic heritage), and SA17 (ensure efficient use of natural resources including waste generation), as development impacts on the historic environment and natural resources are hard to determine without specific details of development sites and design. It may be possible for these uncertain effects to be mitigated through Local Plan policies which focus on design which is considerate and complimentary to such receptors.

Overall, the assessment has found that Options 1, 7a, 7b, 8, and 10 tend to perform better and have more potential significant positive effects compared with the other options where no potential significant positive effects were identified. Of these, Options 1 and 7a are for a lower growth scenario and Options 7b, 8 and 10 are for a higher growth scenario.

A higher number of potential significant negative effects were also recorded for the higher growth scenario options (2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, 6b, 7b and 9b), due to the greater level of development required compared with the lower growth scenario options. .

Once exact details on the location of sites is known this should improve the certainty of these assessments, for those options with the most uncertain effects (which includes Options 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b and 10) which will help further inform the development of a 'preferred spatial strategy option'. This will be developed following further consultation and engagement on the Spatial Strategy Options and through the selection of sites which will contribute to the delivery of the preferred spatial strategy and then testing them through the SA process.

7 Next Steps

The findings of the Spatial Options will inform the preferred spatial strategy option to be taken forward as part of the Local Plan Review. A full formal SA report will be produced at a later stage to accompany the Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19).

There is potential for further options to be developed once the unmet need of Leicester is established and the redistribution of this unmet need is agreed by the Leicester and Leicestershire authorities. Any further options will be assessed following the same method.