Design, Planning and Economics

Submitted to:
Harborough District Council

Submitted by:
AECOM Ltd
Bridgewater House
Manchester
M1 6LT

Harborough Local Plan: Options Consultation

Sustainability Appraisal

Interim Report – Appendix C

September 2015

Appendix C: Settlement Level Appraisals

This appendix contains an assessment of sustainability effects of the nine strategic housing and employment Options (grouped under distinct scenarios) for the following Settlements in the proposed Settlement Hierarchy.

PUA	Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby
SRC	Market Harborough
KC	Lutterworth
KC	Broughton Astley[7]
RC	Billesdon
RC	Fleckney
RC	Great Glen
RC	Houghton on the Hill
RC	Husbands Bosworth
RC	Kibworth
RC	Ullesthorpe

SRV	Bitteswell
SRV	Church Langton
SRV	Claybrooke Magna
SRV	Dunton Bassett
SRV	Foxton
SRV	Gilmorton
SRV	Great Bowden
SRV	Great Easton
SRV	Hallaton
SRV	Lubenham
SRV	Medbourne
SRV	North Kilworth
SRV	South Kilworth
SRV	Swinford
SRV	Tilton
SRV	Tugby

[7] No assessment undertaken for Broughton Astley as the settlement strategy is already determined in the Neighbourhood Plan, hence effects are neutral across the board.

The effects of each Scenario are presented against the six SA Topics listed below, which encapsulate the SA Framework.

SA Topic	SA Objectives covered
1. Natural Environment	*Biodiversity, agricultural land, soil, water geodiversity*
2. Built and Natural Heritage	*Landscape & settlement character, heritage*
3. Health and Wellbeing	*Education, health, recreation, open space access to services, air quality, community cohesion*
4. Resilience to Climate Change	*Flooding, green infrastructure*
5. Housing and Economy	*Housing delivery, rural economy, investment*
6. Resource Use	*Energy efficiency, water efficiency, carbon emissions, minerals*

To determine the effects on each SA Topic, consideration has been given to the factors listed in the SEA Regulations to determine whether the effects are significant or not, for example: *the nature of effects (including magnitude and duration); the sensitivity of receptors; the Likelihood of effects occurring; and the significance of effects*

These factors have been considered to predict effects against each SA Topic using the following scoring system.

- Major positive ✓✓✓
- Moderate positive ✓✓
- Minor positive ✓
- Insignificant impacts -
- Minor negative ×
- Moderate negative ××
- Major negative ×××
- Uncertain effect ?

Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby

Scenarios tested for Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Scraptoft. Thurby and Bushby to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth through an SDA (1000-1182 dwellings)	4,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*		*3 ha*	*17 ha*	The scenarios have not been sub-divided to reflect access to employment opportunities at any of the SDAs in Harborough. This is because there are stronger links to employment opportunities in Leicester, and the SDAs at Lutterworth and Kibworth are some distance away from Thurnby / Scraptoft and Bushby.
		7, 8			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
2	Moderate- growth (303-478 dwellings)	2, 3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
3	Low growth (73-166 dwellings)	1,5,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		6		*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
4	No growth	9	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	*5*	*3 ha*	*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	✘✘	Scenario 3	✘	Scenario 4	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Development may offer the opportunities to enhance biodiversity, particularly at a strategic development area. There would be a limited effect on the natural environment with scenario 3 and none with scenario 4 where no growth would occur. However, this also means there would be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity too. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3. Due to the scale of development in Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, further investigation may be needed to assess the effects on water quality.							
Sensitivity of receptors	There is an area of separation to prevent coalescence between Scraptoft and Thurnby/Bushby. There is also presence of a Green Wedge (Leicester/Scraptoft) for similar reasons. There are no SSSIs in the vicinity, there are however a number of Wildlife Corridors, Thurnby Brook, Dismantled Railway, Bushby Brook, Bushby Spinney and hedge line along watercourse. This includes notable species such as Golden Plover, Goldfinch, Starling and Green Woodpecker. The site is Grade 3 agricultural land. The Scraptoft Local Nature Reserve (13.93 ha) lies off the Beeby Road on the north eastern border of Scraptoft village. It forms part of the Green Wedge above.							
Likelihood of effects	The loss of agricultural land would be inevitable, as many development sites are greenfield and classified as Grade 3. Effects on biodiversity would be dependent upon the scale of development and crucially the mitigation and enhancement measures secured. At this stage, there is uncertainty about what measures would be proposed. It is likely that with higher growth in Scenario 1 and 2, there will be negative effects.							
Significance	In Scenario 1 there are mixed effects on the natural environment. There are negative losses in terms of agricultural land; however due to scale of proposed development, there is potential for biodiversity to be enhanced as well, particularly in a strategic manner. A relief road could potentially have beneficial effects on air quality by relieving congestion, although it is unclear whether this would have a beneficial effect on the natural environment. At this stage a minor negative effect is predicted. A moderate negative effect is predicted for Scenario 2. There is the potential for negative effects on local wildlife and loss of agricultural land. Whilst mitigation could be possible, it is unlikely to be of a strategic nature given that development would be more piecemeal. This option would also be likely to add to congestion problems in the area, which could have effects on air quality. Scenario 3 will result in loss of agricultural land, but at a lower scale compared to Scenerios 1 and 2. . With a lower scale of development, it is more likely that sensitive areas for wildlife could be protected. Overall, a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 4 offers no change but similarly no opportunities for enhancement. A neutral effect is predicted.							

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	-	Scenario 4	✓
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenario 2, and less of an issue for Scenarios 3 and 4.							
Sensitivity of receptors	Both Scraptoft and Thurnby and Bushy are within Conservation Areas. Scraptoft has 12 Listed buildings, including eight Grade II and one Grade I (Church of All Saints). It also has a Scheduled Monument (Churchyard Cross, All Saints' Church). Thurnby and Bushby has eleven Grade II Listed Buildings. There are a number of sites of archaeological interest across both areas and this also includes areas of ridge and furrow on land at Manor Field South. The SDA could affect an Area of Separation, but some areas are classified as having medium/medium high capacity to accommodate landscape change. Areas to the South of Thurnby and Bushby have low capacity to accommodate changes to the landscape.							
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation ought to be possible, but effects on landscape would be inevitable with the development of an SDA. The location and extent of development at non SDA sites for Scenario 2 and 3 could also have effects, but these may be at a lesser scale.							
Significance	Scenario 1 would have a moderate negative effect on the landscape as it would lead to development in an Area of Separation. Mitigation could help to minimise effects and perhaps generate positives, but this is uncertain. Scenario 2 is likely to have an effect on landscape character, but there is deliverable land available for development that is fairly accommodating of growth. Therefore, a minor negative effect is anticipated. Mitigation could help to minimise effects and perhaps generate positives, but this is uncertain. Scenario 3 would promote fairly low growth and it is likely that landscape would be protected. As such, the effects are predicted to be neutral. Scenario 4 is predicted to have a minor positive effect as there would be no growth. In the absence of the Local Plan, development would be anticipated to come forward in this area, and therefore this Scenario ought to better protect the built and natural heritage in this area.							

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3	✓	Scenario 4	-
Nature of effects	Increased housing and employment ought to have a positive effect on wellbeing by improving choice and affordability and access to a job. Development could put pressure on local facilities, but at higher levels may also create the critical mass needed to support viable new facilities. Development ought to improve community infrastructure through contributions to open space enhancement, particularly large levels.							
Sensitivity of receptors	There are number of primary schools in the county/city catchment area including Fernvale Primary School and St Luke's Church of England Primary School in Thurnby. There is no current capacity to meet growth, and s106 contributions towards primary school extensions and other school extensions (11-16 and post 16) would be sought. There would be an impact on existing GP practices in area. There is sufficient capacity to manage increased growth. Bushby Branch of the Billesdon Surgery is indicated as having capacity to provide additional services and accommodate anticipated growth. There are lots of open spaces and recreational grounds around Scraptoft.							
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient land to accommodate the levels of housing growth proposed in each scenario. Scenario 2 could generate more traffic congestion, as it does not involve a relief road. However, development in the Leicester PUA ought to reduce the need to travel long distances to work and facilities. A relief road associated with the SDA ought to have a positive effect on congestion, which could be beneficial fir health and wellbeing. Moderate levels of growth are less likely to achieve a relief road due and could have incremental effects on congestion.							
Significance	Scenario 1 would support new highways infrastructure, significant housing provision and new community facilities, which would be positive in terms of increasing hosing choice and affordability and access to essential services. However, this housing might be accessed from people in Leicester. Conversely, development of this scale could have negative effects on community identity as the rural nature of this area would be changed. On balance a moderate positive effect is predicted. For Scenario 2, housing growth would be likely to meet local needs, and could also support enhancements to open space, health facilities and education. The lower scale of growth compared to Scenario 1 ought to better preserve community identity. However, development would be piecemeal, which may not secure new facilities, and might have incremental adverse effects on congestion. On balance, a moderate positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would have similar effects to Scenario 2 but at a lesser scale, and so a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 4 would promote low levels of growth, which ultimately could have a neutral effect, as there would be limited enhancement or housing provision. However, residents in the area would still have good access in to Leicestershire (albeit by car).							

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-	Scenario 4	-
Nature of effects	The level of development on greenfield land associated with Scenarios 1 and 2 have the potential to lead to an increase in surface water run-off by increasing impermeable areas of land. The level of development for Scenario 3 and 4 is very low and unlikely to have any effects. The development of an SDA could present the opportunity to achieve strategic enhancements to green infrastructure with positive implications for flood risk.							
Sensitivity of receptors	In terms of flooding there are areas around Thurnby Brook within existing built up settlement which are Flood Zone 2. This is partly in the Thurnby and the Bushby parish. There is also an area of Flood Zone 3 around brook in north east of the parish close to Keyham. There are also areas of Flood Risk 2 and 3 around Bushby Brook to west and south of Thurnby and around Thurnby Brook at northern boundary of parish. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly.							
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that development would be encouraged in areas at risk of flooding, but this may become more of an issue at higher levels of growth. Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs. However, the intention is to 'minimise the net increase in surface water run-off discharged to sewers', which means that an increase might be anticipated in some areas.							
Significance	The level of development on greenfield land associated with Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 could potentially lead to an increase in surface water run-off rates. Although plan policies would seek to manage the impacts and incorporate SUDs there is potential for a cumulative negative effect on local flood risk from surface water. Conversely, development could present the opportunities to enhance flood management infrastructure, which has been recorded as an uncertain effect for Scenario 1. For Scenarios 2-4, the level of development would be lower and thus the effects are predicted to be neutral as areas of flood risk would be easier to avoid and cumulative effects on surface water would be reduced. **Recommendation**: Development ought to seek to ensure a net reduction or neutral effect on surface water run-off rates, rather than seeking to '*minimise the net increase' (which suggests that an increase is anticipated and accepted).* A review of Policy CS10 would be beneficial.							

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3	✓	Scenario 4	✘
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would deliver a significant amount of housing at a sustainable urban extension, helping to improve choice and support local provision of affordable and market homes. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the town centre, as well as creating new jobs in construction over the plan period. Scenario 2 would involve moderate growth which would support new market and affordable homes in Scraptoft / Thurnby / Bushby. Scenario 3 would involve low levels of growth that would have limited effects. Scenario 4 would restrict opportunities for housing growth.							
Sensitivity of receptors	Communities have good access to job opportunities in Leicester, although this tends to be by car.							
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient capacity in the draft SHLAA (2015) to meet housing targets under each scenario. However, the deliverability and viability of an SDA needs to be tested.							
Significance	Scenario 1 would deliver a significant level of housing, supporing the local village and new community facilities. Commuting into the city is presumed as there is no employment provision with the SDA. Nevertheless a major positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would have a moderate positive effect by increasing housing choice and affordability. It would also help to support the vitality of local villages, but would be less likely to support new facilities. Scenario 3 would lead to lower levels of growth, which would have a minor positive effects Scenario 4 would be unlikely to address housing needs in this area, and therefore a minor negative effect is predicted.							

Resource use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	-	Scenario 4	-
Nature of effects	With increased development there is likely to be more car usage and increased use of fuel and emissions. Whilst there are good bus links to Leicester, a modal shift would need to take place. This is possible, but would not be in the short term. With this in mind, putting more residents in these areas rather than other rural centres would be positive in terms of reducing GHGs.							
Sensitivity of receptors	Scraptoft and Thurnby and Bushy contribute some 2.3 Tonnes per person of CO2 emissions from domestic electricity and gas consumption (based on 2011 data). The majority of homes have access to mains gas. The settlement is reasonably well served by daytime bus services, but there is no local train station.							
Likelihood of effects	An increase in emissions from travel is likely with increased car use. However with major development such as in Scenario 1 there is an opportunity to create new communities and facilities close to homes, which could reduce car trips and encourage walking and public transport use. Each scenario would be likely to lead to increased travel into Leicester though, as there are no employment opportunities to be delivered in Scraptoft / Thurnby / Bushby alongside the SDA.							
Significance	Scenario 1 ought to have a positive effect by reducing the amount of growth located in rural areas and locating it in an SDA (which ought to promote more sustainable access to local facilities. Scenario 2 would deliver a fairly high level of growth in the Leicester PUA, which ought to reduce carbon emissions by locating development in areas close to amenities and jobs in Leicester as opposed to rural areas in Harborough. Therefore a minor positive effect is predicted. The scale of growth proposed under scenarios 3 and 4 would be unlikely to have a significant effect on carbon emissions and thus neutral effects are predicted.							

Summary of effects for Scraptoft, Thurnby and Bushby

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✓	✗✗	✗	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗✗	✗	-	✓
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓✓	✓✓	✓	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✗
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✓	✓	-	-

Market Harborough

Scenarios tested for Market Harborough

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Market Harborough to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Market Harborough. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate-high growth (1983 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Employment provision is consistent for every housing strategy option. Differences in the provision of employment land in Lutterworth, Fleckney and Kibworth are not likely to affect residents in Market Harborough, as there is already good access to employment opportunities locally and good transport links to larger centres of employment. The proposed level of housing in each scenario is in addition to the SDA which is committed as part of the Adopted Core Strategy.
2	Moderate-high growth (1329 dwellings)	2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
3	Low - moderate growth (775-866 dwellings)	1, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
4	Low growth (333-450 dwellings)	7	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3 ha*	*24 ha*	
		6		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
5	Very low / no growth (0-52 dwellings)	8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excluding strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Market Harborough

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	✘	Scenario 4	-	Scenario 5	✓
Nature of effects	Biodiversity - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such as hedgerows, grassland and trees. The effects would be likely to be more pronounced for Scenario 1 due to the higher level of growth, and less likely for scenarios 2-5, which would involve lower levels of growth. There would be no effect on biodiversity with scenario 5 as no/little growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity and green infrastructure under this Scenario. Conversely, the potential to enhance green infrastructure could be higher for Scenarios involving higher rates of growth. Environmental quality - There would be an increasing loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenarios 1 (most loss) to 5 (least loss). Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality and congestion if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the town centre. This could potentially be an issue for scenarios 1 and 2 which would generate a greater number of trips locally potentially without supporting strategic highways improvements. Low levels of development would occur for Scenarios 4 and 5, so local effects on air quality would be unlikely.									
Sensitivity of receptors	The 2008 Phase 1 Habitat Survey concluded that the landscape surrounding Market Harborough is relatively featureless comprising mainly arable fields and well managed hedgerows with a few notable exceptions: The Rivers Welland and Jordan, railways and canals form corridors of woodland, running water, hedgerows and ruderal habitat into and through the town. Badgers, bats, reptiles and great crested newts have been recorded within Market Harborough. There are no SSSIs or designated Local Wildlife Sites within close proximity to Market Harborough, although the Northern edge does fall within a SSSI risk zone isochrones that requires residential development over 100 dwellings to consult with Natural England. Market Harborough is surrounded by Grade 3 agricultural land. Travel to work: 62% of people use a car or van to get to work, far fewer than for the District at 71%. Congestion in the town centre is of local concern but the speed of traffic through the centre is generally limited allowing for reasonably safe pedestrian movement and cycling. There are no air quality issues at present.									
Likelihood of effects	Although the land surrounding Market Harborough is not sensitive in terms of biodiversity, there would be a loss of green space, and for some sites potential disturbance and loss of features of local interest such as trees, hedges and ponds. At lower levels of growth it would be easier to avoid the most sensitive sites, and / or achieve suitable mitigation and compensation. For higher levels of growth on large urban extension sites, it is more likely that strategic improvements to green infrastructure could be secured. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land under each of the scenarios, with a greater amount for scenarios 1 and 2, and virtually no loss under Scenario 5. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the town centre by car could potentially increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges. The likelihood of this affecting congestion through the town centre would need to be modelled. However, car usage is lower than the district average due to good access to jobs, services and public transport. Therefore, new development in Market Harborough ought to generate lesser trips per head compared to development elsewhere in the District. For scenarios that involve significant growth, there may also be potential to support strategic link roads that mitigate potential effects on the town centre.									

Significance	Biodiversity is unlikely to be significantly affected at lower levels of growth (Scenarios 4 and 5), as the sensitivity of the surrounding areas is relatively low, and mitigation ought to be secured for new developments. At this level of growth, it also ought to be possible to avoid areas of importance for local wildlife, and thus a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 4. For Scenario 5, the level of growth would be lower than would be expected to occur naturally in the absence of the Plan, and so there would be greater protection of greenspace. This constitutes a minor positive effect on biodiversity. For Scenarios 1 and 2, the loss of land would be more significant, and could affect locally important habitats. Conversely, development of this scale could present opportunities for strategic improvements to green infrastructure. At this stage, it is unclear what sites would come forward, or whether enhancement would be secured. Therefore, a minor negative effect is predicted for scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 3, would have similar effects, but on a lesser scale, and thus a minor negative effect is predicted on biodiversity. There would be a loss of agricultural land under scenarios 1-4, which would be unavoidable. For scenarios 1-4, the total amount of land would be substantial. This constitutes a minor negative effect for scenarios 1 and 2, which would involve higher levels of growth. For scenarios 1-4, there would be an increase in car trips which could contribute to congestion in the town centre, and affect air quality. The extent of effects is unclear at this stage as traffic modelling has not been undertaken. However, air quality is not currently an issue, and new development could secure infrastructure enhancements to help mitigate any increases in traffic. An uncertain effect is predicted at this stage. Overall, Scenario 1 is predicted to have a moderate negative effect on natural resources, reflecting potential effects on biodiversity and air quality, and the definite loss of agricultural land. Enhancement might be possible, but it is unclear if and how this would be secured at this stage. Scenarios 2 and 3 would have similar effects but on a lesser scale, and hence a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 4 would have a neutral effect overall as the level of growth would be modest, and help to protect greater areas of agricultural land and green space. Scenario 4 would lead to lower growth and thus greater protection for greenspace and agricultural land which constitutes a minor positive effect overall.

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	-	Scenario 4	✓	Scenario 5	✓✓
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenarios 2, 3 and 4, and not an issue at all for Scenario 5.									
Sensitivity of receptors	There is mixed capacity for the landscape to accommodate change. To the north, there is low capacity, reflecting the need to maintain areas of separation with Great Bowden. The South East is less sensitive, and has a higher capacity to accommodate change; the east has only moderate capacity to change and there is also a need to maintain a separation with Lubenham. Listed buildings are located throughout Market Harborough, but are mainly concentrated in the town centre, away from the bulk of potential development sites on the settlement edge.									
Likelihood of effects	For Scenarios 1 and 2, it is likely that more sensitive areas may need to be developed to meet the higher housing targets. The ability to mitigate effects would be limited where the capacity to accommodate change is low or moderate. For scenario 3, there would be less pressure to release land, and thus, it would be less likely that sensitive areas would need to be developed. For Scenario 4, it ought to be possible to deliver the housing in areas of least sensitivity, whilst for Scenario 5 it is certain that landscape would be unaffected by new development. The setting of heritage assets in the town centre is unlikely to be affected by new development, which would most likely be on the edge of the settlement. It is assumed that any heritage assets adjacent to site boundaries could be protected and enhanced through application of Plan policies, and careful design.									
Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 would require substantial development on sites around Market Harborough. At this stage, it is uncertain exactly where development would occur, but the location of developable sites suggests that for these options, there would be a need for substantial development to the South and South East/West of the Town. The landscape capacity to accommodate change in these areas ranges from medium to high capacity. Therefore, whilst negative effects on the character of the landscape could occur, these should in the main be possible to mitigate. For scenario 3, there would be a lower level of growth compared to Scenarios 1 and 2, and it therefore ought to be easier to avoid the most sensitive sites in terms of landscape. The lower scale of growth would also lead to less cumulative effects on landscape character. For Scenario 5, there would be little or no growth, which would have a moderate positive effect on the settlement, as it would help to maintain its current form and character (which is fairly sensitive to change in some areas). Without a plan in place, it would be likely that some level of growth would occur as development would be determined in line with the NPPF and a presumption in favour of sustainable development.									

Health and Wellbeing (SA objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3	✓	Scenario 4	-	Scenario 5	✘
Nature of effects	Increased provision of housing under Scenarios 1-4 would provide increased choice of housing for local residents, as well as for those in surrounding settlements. This ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing given that access to decent, affordable housing is a key determinant of health. The effects would be of a greater magnitude for Scenario 1, reducing through Scenario 2, 3 and 4. Increased population associated with new housing would also need to be supported by improved health and education facilities. For each scenario, contributions to schools and education capacity would be sought. However, at higher levels of development, it may be more viable to support new schools and a Primary Care Hospital Hub, rather than extensions to existing facilities. In this respect, Scenarios 1 and 2 are more beneficial than Scenarios 3 and 4. Scenario 5 would provide no or very low levels of housing, and thus opportunities to enhance housing choice and health facilities would not exist. At higher levels of growth, there is greater potential for enhancement of open space through developer contributions.									
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 21894 (increase of 14.1% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over same period). S106 contributions would be sought towards the potential establishment of an Integrated Primary Care Hospital Hub in Market Harborough to provide additional GP accommodation. Capacity of local primary schools, 11-16 and post 16 educational establishments. There is no capacity to meet growth. In addition to a potential new 420 place new primary school (SDA), S106 contributions would be sought for extensions to existing primary schools and other local 11-16/16+ schools.									
Likelihood of effects	To meet high levels of growth in Market Harborough there would be a need to release strategic sites. Given the scale of these sites it is more likely that they will be well planned, and would deliver contributions to health, education and open space.									
Significance	Scenario 1 is predicted to have a major positive effect on health and wellbeing in Market Harborough as it would deliver a wide range of housing choice, as well as helping to support new or improved education, health and community infrastructure. The effects would be the same for Scenario 2, but at a lesser scale, hence a moderate positive effect is predicted. The effects for Scenario 3 would be lesser still, so a minor positive effect is predicted For scenario 4, the level of growth would be fairly low in the context of Market Harborough's role as the main settlement, and therefore, the effects are considered to be neutral. For Scenario 5, a minor negative effect is predicted, as the level of growth is minimal, and would not help to support improvements in social infrastructure.									

Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	-	Scenario 4	-	Scenario 5	-
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 - 4, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 5 would not involve much development, so effects would be neutral. Although plan policies would seek to limit surface water run-off into the sewer system (Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy), this would not ensure that there was no net increase in run off. Therefore, there could be the potential for cumulative effects on flood risk locally where higher levels of development are proposed.									
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood risk zones 2 and 3 run along the River Welland through the town and beyond and around the River Jordan through Little Bowden and to the south of the town.									
Likelihood of effects	The majority of developable sites are not at risk of flooding and hence effects would be unlikely in this respect for each Scenario. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs. However, the intention is to '*minimise the net increase in surface water run-off discharged to sewers'*, which means that an increase might be anticipated in some areas.									
Significance	The level of development on greenfield land associated with scenarios 1 and 2 in particular could potentially lead to an increase in surface water run-off rates, and may also require the development of land adjacent to areas of flood risk. Although plan policies would seek to manage the impacts and incorporate SUDs, there is potential for a cumulative negative effect on local flood risk from surface water. Conversely, development could present the opportunities to enhance flood management infrastructure. Nevertheless, a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenarios 1 and 2 in line with the precautionary principle. For scenarios 3 and 4, the level of development would be lower and thus the effects are predicted to be neutral as areas of flood risk would be easier to avoid and cumulative effects on surface water would be reduced. **Recommendation**: Development ought to seek to ensure a net reduction or neutral effect on surface water run-off rates, rather than seeking to '*minimise the net increase' (which suggests that an increase is anticipated and accepted).* A review of Policy CS10 would be beneficial.									

Housing and Economy (SA objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3	✓	Scenario 4	-	Scenario 5	✗✗
Nature of effects	Housing growth will provide greater housing choice in and around Market Harborough as well as contributing affordable housing. The provision of housing in Market Harborough would also ensure good access to employment opportunities in the town, as well as further afield through train links. Lower levels of housing growth (under scenarios 3 and 4) could lead to a lack of choice, and would not help to support a growing population.									
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 21894 (increase of 14.1% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over same period). Market Harborough's population age structure is generally younger than the District as a whole with a particularly healthy numbers in the 0-15 and 25-34 age groups. S106 contributions would be sought towards the potential establishment of an Integrated Primary Care Hospital Hub in Market Harborough to provide additional GP accommodation. There is a wide range of employers in the area, with employment areas found across the town. Many people also commute to Leicester and London, which are very accessible by train.									
Likelihood of effects	There are deliverable sites in the SHLAA (2014) to support 3572 dwellings, with 1590 deliverable within the first 10 years of the Plan. It is therefore likely that the housing targets identified under all of the Scenarios could be achieved. Housing is relatively highly priced, but an increased amount ought to lead to a wider choice and more affordable homes as supply meets demand.									
Significance	Scenario 1 would deliver a substantial amount of housing, helping to create a wider choice of housing. It would also ensure that new homes are well related to services and employment opportunities. A major positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would have similar effects but at a smaller scale, and hence moderate positive effects are predicted. For Scenario 3, the level of growth would be fairly low compared to the rate of growth in dwellings between 2001-20011 of 16.6%. Therefore, only minor positive effects are predicted. Scenario 4 would deliver a fairly low level of housing growth, and hence neutral effects are predicted. Scenario 5 would not deliver any further growth, which could have moderate negative effects by not supporting growth in a sustainable location.									

Resource Use (SA objective 9)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	✓	Scenario 4	-	Scenario 5	✘
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-3 would be likely to lead to increased road trips with associated greenhouse gas emissions. However, Market Harborough has good access to jobs and services, and in broad terms, will support more sustainable patterns of growth compared to growth in smaller rural centres. New development will lead to an overall increase in energy and water use in Market Harborough. However, this would be the case wherever development was located, so the effects are the same regardless of Scenarios (I.E. the effects are neutral).									
Sensitivity of receptors	Each of the wards of Market Harborough there are around 10% of homes that rely on electricity for heating. This means that there is a higher carbon contribution and that these homes have a higher risk of falling into fuel poverty. The carbon contributions across the four wards are 1.8, 1.8, 2.0 and 2.1 tonnes per head of population (based on 2011 figures). Market Harborough has a higher level of sustainable transport, so contributions to carbon emissions from transport per head will be lower.									
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available in Market Harborough, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Due to the higher heat demand in Market Harborough, provision of district heating may be a possibility depending upon the location and type of development. There is good access to sustainable modes of transport, and so increased housing growth in Harborough is less likely to result in increased car trips and emissions compared to more rural areas in the district.									
Significance	Scenario 1 is predicted to have a moderate positive effect, as it will locate more growth in Market Harborough, which as the most well served settlement in the district ought to support more sustainable modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. Similar effects are predicted for Scenarios 2 and 3, but at a lesser scale and thus minor positive effects are predicted. For Scenario 4, the status quo is likely to be continued, and thus a neutral effect is predicted. Scenario 5 would divert further development away from Market Harborough, and there would be greater development in Rural Centres, villages and a combination of SDAs. Although growth at SDAs could encourage sustainable patterns of travel to an extent, the overall effect would be negative in terms of increased carbon emissions, thus a minor negative effect is predicted.									

Summary of effects for Market Harborough

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗✗	✗	✗	-	✓
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗✗	✗	-	✓	✓✓
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	-	✗
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	✗	✗	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	-	✗✗
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✓✓	✓	✓	-	✗

Lutterworth

Scenarios tested for Lutterworth

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Lutterworth to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Lutterworth. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Very High Growth at an SDA in Lutterworth (1950-2238 Dwellings)	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3ha*	*23 ha*	Higher employment provision is proposed in Lutterworth under Scenario 1. This would be delivered as part of an urban extension (SDA) to Lutterworth. For Scenario 1, housing option 9 also proposes 5 hectares employment provision at Kibworth through an SDA. For options 6 and 8 under the same Scenario, there is no provision in Kibworth. However, it was not considered necessary to sub-divide scenario 1 as there are significant job opportunities in Lutterworth, Market Harborough and Magna Park. This makes any employment growth in Kibworth less important for communities in Lutterworth, and it is also less accessible (particularly by public transport). Therefore, these three scenarios are driven by housing and employment growth in Lutterworth itself.
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	
2	High Growth (506-645 dwellings)	2, 3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
3	Moderate Growth (357-398 dwellings)	1, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2	✘✘	Scenario 3	✘
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* – Scenario 1 would lead to the loss of large areas of green space / agricultural land, and would be located near to areas of importance to wildlife, which could have a direct effect through disturbance and changes to hydrology. Conversely, an SDA would be likely to present opportunities for enhancement and the creation of new greenspace, which could have positive effects on wildlife. For scenarios 2 and 3 development would involve the release of land on the settlement edge, which could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such as hedgerows, grassland and trees. The effects would be more pronounced for Scenario 2, which would involve higher levels of growth, and lesser for Scenario 3, which would involve lower growth. *Environmental quality* – For Scenario 1, there would be a significant and permanent loss of agricultural land, which is currently in use. There would be a loss of Grade 3 agricultural land for Scenarios 2 and 3. For Scenarios 2 and 3, growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. Scenario 1 would generate significant trips as the level of growth would be substantial. However, the visioning document for the SDA suggests that a strategic route would be created through the SDA that could help to alleviate congestion through Lutterworth Town Centre. This could have a positive effect on air quality, but would need to be modelled to confirm whether effects would indeed be positive.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Misterton Marshes SSSI lies just to the East of Lutterworth. For scenario 1, the proposed SDA would cover this site. Protected species records exist around the town for badgers, freshwater crayfish, bullhead and common redstart. These would be potentially affected under each scenario. Some areas of land are also in close proximity to watercourses, which are likely to be of importance to wildlife. An Air quality Management Area is designated around the junction of George Street and Market Street extending to High Street. The town has long been impacted by heavy traffic, particularly HGVs. The majority of land surrounding Lutterworth is classified as Grade 3 agricultural land, although there are patches of Grade 2 land to the east of Lutterworth, which fall within the proposed Lutterworth East SDA.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1, the SDA will lead to the loss of open space and wildlife habitat, a SSSI also runs through the site and although mitigation measures could be secured, a negative effect is predicted at this stage. For Scenarios 2 and 3, development on edge of settlement sites has the potential to disturb wildlife, particularly where it is adjacent to watercourses. The sensitivity of these areas is not likely to be high, and mitigation measures ought to be able to be secured to minimise potential negative effects. The loss of agricultural land would be unavoidable under each scenario, with significant areas being lost under Scenario 1. An increase in development is likely to generate car trips, but it is unclear whether these would affect the town centre, or whether access to the strategic road network could be achieved without passing through Lutterworth. For the SDA, the achievement of a strategic route through the development would be a vital element of the masterplan, and ought to ensure direct access to the strategic road network.					

Significance	Scenario 1 will lead to development in close proximity to the Misterton Marshes SSSI, and will lead to a loss of green space in the surrounding areas. Major negative effects would be anticipated in this respect. It is likely that the SDA would secure mitigation to the Misterton Marshes SSSI, but this has not been factored into the assessment at this stage to allow for a consistent comparison across all the SDAs. Nevertheless, it is important to note that mitigation and enhancement would be anticipated. Scenario 1 will also lead to the permanent loss of agricultural land of Grade 2/3 classification. The total loss would be over 20 hectares and is considered to be significant. This constitutes a negative effect. Although the level of growth proposed through the SDA would be substantial and would generate car trips, the SDA also offers the opportunity to divert traffic away from Lutterworth town centre, which ought to have a positive effect on air quality. On balance, a moderate negative effect is predicted for the natural environment for Scenario 1. This reflects the potential effects on biodiversity and agricultural land, but acknowledges that there could be improvements to air quality and that enhancement to green infrastructure would be likely. **Recommendation** - The loss of agricultural land could be offset somewhat through the provision of community allotments as part of the SDA. Scenario 2 would lead to the loss of agricultural land of Grade 3 classification. It would also lead to disturbance to wildlife habitats and a loss of greenspace. Although mitigation would help to reduce effects, the potential for strategic enhancement would be limited, as the sites would be spread around the settlement and are mostly bounded by physical barriers such as the M1 and southern bypass. The level of development would generate additional car trips which may need to travel through the town centre to access the strategic road networks. This has the potential to have a negative effect on air quality in the AQMA. On balance, Scenario 2 is predicted to have a moderate negative effect on the natural environment in Lutterworth. Scenario 3 would have similar effects to Scenario 2, but the scale of growth would be lower, and therefore, the negative effects are predicted to be minor.

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	For Scenario 1, the SDA would lead to a significant change to the character of the countryside to the East of Lutterworth. For Scenarios 2 and 3, development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and nature of the settlement. Increased development could also lead to more car trips through and to the town centre, which could have negative implications with regards to the setting and enjoyment of the built environment.					
Sensitivity of receptors	In broad terms, the areas to the south of the settlement are less constrained by landscape compared to those in the North. In particular, the area between Lutterworth and the neighbouring village of Bitteswell is very sensitive as the two settlements are very close to total coalescence. There is a Conservation Area covering most of the town centre, which is also where the majority of the 50 Listed Buildings are located. There are numerous areas of potential archaeological value identified within and surrounding Lutterworth.					
Likelihood of effects	At higher levels of growth it is possible that development could take place in areas of sensitive landscape (*given that there are limited alternatives around the settlement (some sites have been ruled as undeliverable, whilst other areas have not yet been proposed*). Mitigation measures are unlikely to be able to address adverse landscape impacts in some areas, particularly to the South East. The SDA would lead to a significant change to the character of the countryside to the East of Lutterworth. The SDA would in effect be separated from Lutterworth by the M1, but the physical extent of the town would be extended into the countryside, affecting the context of the town. The proposed SDA could seek to implement enhancements to green infrastructure, achieve sensitive design and create stronger links to the countryside from Lutterworth on foot and cycle. These could help to offset any negative effects on the countryside. Given that the majority of designated heritage assets are located in the town centre, it is unlikely that development at the settlement edges or in the SDA would lead to a visual effect or loss of these features. However, increased levels of traffic through the town could affect the setting of heritage assets. This would be most prominent for Scenario 2, and less so for Scenario 3 (of the non SDA options).					
Significance	Scenario 1 would lead to development in large areas of countryside to the east of Lutterworth. These areas are rural in nature, and the character would be significantly changed. Development would stretch down to areas adjacent to Misterton, and although there would be a degree of screening, the character of the open countryside around Misterton would be affected. Although mitigation and enhancement could be secured, it is likely that a negative effect on landscape would occur. The effects on built heritage assets in Lutterworth are unlikely to be significant given that they are some distance away. The SDA could also help to improve access to the countryside for existing and new residents. On balance a moderate negative effect is predicted. For Scenarios 2 and 3, growth would not be delivered through an SDA, and rather would be secured at edge of settlement sites around Lutterworth. The majority of sites identified as deliverable in the SHLAA are not particularly sensitive, and have medium – high capacity to change. Designated heritage assets are also focused in the town centre away from these areas, so effects on the built environment are unlikely. For scenario 2, the higher levels of growth may lead to development of some more sensitive areas, and could also generate more car trips through the town which could affect the setting of heritage. Therefore, a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 2. The effects are considered to be neutral for Scenario 3, as the level of development ought not to have a significant effect on heritage and development could be accommodated in areas with higher capacity to accommodate change.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 deliver a substantial amount of new market and affordable housing that would benefit local communities. It would also support a new primary school and local centre as part of the SDA. This would have a positive effect on health and wellbeing in terms of providing new facilities in Lutterworth, without putting additional pressure on existing schools. The SDA could also provide enhanced green infrastructure and links to the countryside, which ought to have a positive effect on wellbeing for new and existing communities. Scenarios 2 and 3 would require increased provision of local school and health provision. This would need to be secured through developer contributions towards school expansions, and/or a new school (more likely to be viable for higher growth under Scenario 2). Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contribution.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 9353 (increase of 1060 or 12.8% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over same period). Current surgeries have capacity to support additional growth but S106 contributions would be sought towards the provision of additional equipment required to meet growth. Additional resources are required to meet expectant demand to be delivered through school extensions. S106 contributions would be sought. There is a shortfall in most types of open space provision (including allotment provision). Appropriate S106 contributions would be sought where a shortfall in certain types of open space is identified.					
Likelihood of effects	Under each scenario, contributions would be sought to improve health facilities, so effects would be anticipated to be neutral. Sufficient school provision ought to be provided under each scenario. For Scenario 1 a new Community Park would be a central part of the SDA, and would be developed in the first phase. It is likely that developments on edge of settlement sites (for Scenarios 2 and 3) could also secure enhancements to open space provision and / or community facilities, which could help to address any identified shortages. These facilities would not be as comprehensive as those secured for the SDA though.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would have a major positive effect on health and wellbeing by securing substantial market and affordable housing. This would support the local population and also attract residents from surrounding communities and/or further afield. The SDA would be include green infrastructure enhancement which would benefit existing and new communities, and would also secure a local centre and school to ensure that new communities have good access to services. Scenario 1 would also involve a relief road that could reduce congestion through Lutterworth. For scenarios 2 and 3, development at settlement edge sites would help to provide housing to support local needs. This would have a positive effect in terms of access to affordable housing. Although of a smaller scale than the SDA, these developments could also secure open space provision, which would benefit local communities. Overall, a minor positive effect is predicted for these scenarios. **Recommendation** – Secure new allotment provision to address identified shortfalls in Lutterworth. The SDA would provide a good opportunity to integrate allotments (into the green infrastructure strategy for the development).					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	?	Scenario 3	?
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 - 3, which would require the development of greenfield land. For scenario 1, the vision for the SDA states that surface water run-off would be managed, so as there was no net increase, and a reduction where possible. Therefore, the effects would be neutral/positive in this respect. Although some development may be adjacent to areas of flood risk, the actual land that is developed is unlikely to be at risk from fluvial flooding, as it falls into Environment Agency Zone 1.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The centre of Lutterworth is not at risk of flooding from rivers and watercourses. However, there are areas at risk of surface water flooding that could correspond with development. The proposed SDA is intersected by areas in flood zone 2 and 3 associated with the River Swift.					
Likelihood of effects	There are areas at risk of flooding on the outskirts of Lutterworth, such as surrounding Bitteswell Brook and the River Swift. However, it is unlikely that development would take place in these areas (assuming that a combination of identified SHLAA sites are developed under Scenarios 2 and 3). For the SDA (Scenario 1), the floodplain of the River Swift would not be developed, and SuDS would be secured to help better manage flooding and surface water run-off. For each scenario, surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and includes SuDS. However, the intention is to '*minimise the net increase in surface water run-off discharged to sewers'*, which means that an increase might be anticipated in some areas. For the SDA, the vision states that development would ensure that run-off would not increase.					
Significance	For Scenario 1, an uncertain positive effect is predicted. Although the SDA would include areas at risk of flooding, it is unlikely that these would be developed, and the use of SuDS could potentially improve flood risk management. Assuming that these measures are successfully implemented, a positive effect would be realised, as the aim would be to reduce surface water run-off. However, an uncertain effect has been predicted at this stage. For Scenarios 2 and 3, development would be unlikely to be in areas at risk of flooding. However, there could be a cumulative effect on increasing surface water run-off, which would be more pronounced for Scenario 2, and less pronounced for Scenario 3. Consequently an uncertain (negative) effect is predicted for scenarios 2 and 3.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would deliver a significant amount of housing at a sustainable urban extension to Lutterworth, helping to support local provision of affordable and market homes. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the town centre, as well as creating new jobs in construction over the plan period. Scenario 1 would also involve new employment areas, which ought to be attractive to modern businesses given their excellent links to the M1. Scenarios 2 and 3 would involve moderate – high growth on the edge of Lutterworth. This would support new market and affordable homes, which would also be likely to require additional employment land.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 9353 (increase of 1060 or 12.8% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over same period). Given Lutterworths role as a town with good links to employment opportunities, there is likely to be a continued need for housing. There is identified capacity across a range of small sites in the SHLAA to deliver approximately 582 dwellings. There are constraints to further settlement expansion such as the M1 to the East and bypass to the South, Areas of Separation between Bitteswell and Magna Park. The town is served by a range of services, facilities and shops and has a healthy retail offering, although there is a limited range and choice of comparison goods. Lutterworth has good links employment opportunities at Magna Park, and larger towns such as Market Harborough, Leicester and Rugby. It also provides employment locally at a range of Key Employment Areas and General Employment Areas (as defined in an Employment Area Review in 2012). There is potential for further employment sites to be developed in Lutterworth.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1, the viability and deliverability of the SDA will need to be tested to ensure that it can be developed as envisaged. The development would be phased, but approximately 500 dwellings could be delivered within 5 years, which would contribute to the District's 5 year supply. The SDA would also deliver land for employment use. Considering the deliverable sites in the SHLAA (2014), there is only capacity to deliver approximately 582 dwellings on strategic sites (with 118 only being deliverable in the longer term 16+years). Therefore, any development above this number (i.e. Scenario 2) might be difficult to deliver unless further potential sites are identified through a call for sites, or it can be demonstrated that there is capacity through windfall development. Given that there are constraints to growth on remaining land around the settlement, it may be difficult to identify further suitable land for development. The housing target in Scenario 3 could be delivered through sites identified in the SHLAA as being available within the next 10 years. Employment land would need to be identified as well to support a growth in population. Lutterworth's role as a Key Centre with good access to employment, is likely to attract further growth in population.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would have a major positive effect on housing and economy by delivering over 1900 new homes and modern employment land as part of an SDA. The SDA would offer the opportunity to create a new community, with supporting local centre and good access to jobs and services. Although Scenario 2 would secure high levels of housing growth compared to historic trends, the effects would be less positive compared to Scenario 1, as the amount of housing would be lower, and a proportion of this would only be deliverable in over 16 years (*if this was to be brought forward) . Scenario 3 would have a similar effect to Scenario 2, but the scale of the effects would be lower, and thus a minor positive effect is predicted.					

Resource use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-3 would be likely to lead to increased road trips with associated greenhouse gas emissions. However, Lutterworth has good access to jobs and services, and in broad terms, will support more sustainable patterns of growth compared to growth in smaller rural centres. Scenario 1 would lead to significant growth in an SDA in Lutterworth, but the offshoot of this would be that growth in surrounding settlements such as Gilmorton, Bitteswell, North and South Kilworth and Ullesthorpe would be lower. Given that these areas are less well served compared to Lutterworth, Scenario 1 is attractive for achieving a reduction in carbon emissions. New development will lead to an overall increase in energy and water use in Lutterworth. However, this would be the case wherever development was located, so the effects are the same regardless of Scenarios (I.E. the effects are neutral).						
Sensitivity of receptors	The four Lutterworth wards have a carbon emissions contribution from domestic gas and electricity use of 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 and 2.1 tonnes per head (based on 2011 data). This is a reflection of house type and Age. Lutterworth Springs ward has 10% of homes on electric heating, which not only causes higher emissions, but also leaves householders at greater risk of fuel poverty. Lutterworth is well served by a range of shops, services and public transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available in Lutterworth so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Lutterworth and any new development would be unlikely to change this. There are reasonable bus services, but the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to significantly increased numbers of people living in an urban extension to Lutterworth; which as a key centre has fairly good access to jobs and services. Therefore, this Scenario is more likely to support growth that helps to reduce carbon emissions (compared to further growth in smaller rural centres). Consequently, a moderate positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would lead to a high level of growth at sites on the edge of Lutterworth. This would help to ensure that new development was in accessible locations, and thus achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from transport (compared to equivalent development in smaller rural centres and villages). Consequently a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of dwelling growth in Lutterworth (2001-2011). Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral					

Summary of effects for Lutterworth

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✘✘	✘✘	✘
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✘✘	✘	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓✓✓	✓	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	?	?
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✓✓	✓	-

Billesdon

Scenarios tested for Billesdon

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Billesdon to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Billesdon. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (59 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Housing growth under these scenarios would be additional to the provisional target of 49 dwellings identified in the Billesdon Neighbourhood Plan. There are variations in employment provision for the options grouped under scenario 3 (options 3-11). However, it is likely that the effects of employment provision for Billesdon would be the same regardless of variations in employment land provision across the 11 options. This is because access to jobs from Billesdon would largely be expected to be in Leicester or other large centres, and employment provision in Lutterworth and/or Kibworth would be less likely to be accessed. Therefore, variations in land provision at these SDAs would not affect the appraisal findings.
2	Moderate growth (17-31 dwellings)	2, 3, 4, 5	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
3	No / low growth (0-8 dwellings)	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		7,		*4 ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*			*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* – A minimum housing target of 45 dwellings has already been established for Billesdon through its Adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore, this ought to form the starting point / baseline position for considering effects. For scenario 1, the minimum housing target of 45 would be exceeded, and therefore, there would be potential for negative effects on wildlife and soil. Scenario 2 would lead to a slightly lower level of additional dwellings compared to the minimum target in the Neighbourhood Plan. This could potentially affect wildlife on development sites. Scenario 3 would lead to low or no growth above the NP Target, and thus the effects would be very small. *Environmental quality* - There may be a loss of land classified as Grade 3 or Grade 2 under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenario 2. Higher levels of growth can affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. However, the scale of growth is not substantial enough to have any effect.					
Sensitivity of receptors	4 areas of mesotrophic grassland designated as LWS to north of A47. There are features of local wildlife interest that could be affected by new development such as field margins and trees. Agricultural land surrounding Billesdon is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	For scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent scenario 2) there could be disturbances to open space as a result of new development, but mitigation ought to be possible. There may be a small loss of agricultural land under scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2.					
Significance	Scenario could lead disturbance or loss of wildlife of local value and best and most versatile agricultural lands. Although mitigation ought to be possible a moderate negative effect is predicted, as considerable further development is proposed compared to the Neighbourhood Plan. Scenario 2 would have similar effects to Scenario 1, but at a smaller scale, and hence a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would have neutral effects, as it essentially represents the Neighbourhood Plan position.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be an issue for Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent Scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Billesdon contains a Conservation Area, with 43 listed Buildings. The capacity for landscape to accommodate change is largely categorised as 'medium' 'medium-low' or 'low'.					
Likelihood of effects	Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an effect on the character of the settlement. However, the small scale of growth under scenarios 2 and 3 ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would require a substantially higher level of growth than identified as the minimum target in the Neighbourhood Plan. This presents the potential for negative effects on built and natural heritage, and there are sensitive areas of landscape that may be difficult to avoid. A moderate negative effect is therefore predicted. mitigation ought to be successfully secured; however an uncertain effect is predicted. Scenario 2 could have similar effects to Scenario 2, but at a smaller scale, and hence a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 3 is essentially the baseline position established by the Neighbourhood Plan and so neutral effects are predicted.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2) would support the development of additional dwellings in Billesdon. This could help to increase affordable housing provision locally and deliver improvements to open space through development contributions; these factors would both contribute to improved health and wellbeing. Scenario 3 would deliver limited growth.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Between 2001 and 2011 there was a population increase of 21% in Billesdon. The age profile shows that there is an aging population.					
Likelihood of effects	Primary schools can be extended to support additional growth associated with Scenario 2. It may be more difficult to accommodate higher levels of growth under Scenario 1.					
Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 would provide a higher housing figure than that established in the Neighbourhood Plan, which would help to further expand housing choice that would benefit the local population. However, it may be difficult to accommodate the additional population at education and health facilities locally. Therefore, a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 is essentially the baseline position established by the Neighbourhood Plan and so neutral effects are predicted.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development may lead to increased areas of impermeable land, which could contribute to higher surface water run-off.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is no identified flood risk by the Environment Agency. Surface water flooding may be a localised issue.					
Likelihood of effects	Development is unlikely to be at risk of flooding and is not likely to contribute significantly to flooding elsewhere as the scale of growth is modest and surface water management from new development would need to be managed through the use of SuDS.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would require a higher level of growth than identified as the minimum target in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, there are no areas at risk of flooding, nor would the level of growth have an impact on surface water run-off. Consequently, a neutral effect is predicted. Scenario 3 is essentially the baseline position established by the Neighbourhood Plan and so neutral effects are predicted.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would support the development of additional housing growth in Billesdon (compared to the target of 45 identified in the Adopted Neighbourhood Plan. This ought to increase housing choice and affordability locally, having a positive effect on meeting needs and supporting the local economy.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Between 2001 and 2011 there was a population increase of 21% in Billesdon. Billesdon has good road links to Leicester, and employment opportunities are likely to be accessible in the City.					
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient developable land identified in the SHLAA (2015) to ensure that additional development under each Scenario could be delivered.					
Significance	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would help to plan for a higher housing figure than that established in the Neighbourhood Plan, helping to provide further housing choice that would benefit the local population. An increased population would also help to support the vitality of the village. Therefore, a moderate positive effect is predicted for Scenario 1 and a minor positive effect for Scenario 2 (which is of a lesser scale). Scenario 3 is essentially the baseline position established by the Neighbourhood Plan and so neutral effects are predicted.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Additional development under Scenarios 1 and 2 could lead to increased use of resources through the need for energy and water in new development, and the generation of increased car trips. However, this would be the case wherever development occurs.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Billesdon has a significant number of off-gas properties, mainly reliant on oil for fuel. Reliance on oil for heating can lead to an increased risk of fuel poverty, particularly in older hard to treat homes. The carbon emissions across Billesdon ward due to domestic electricity and gas consumption is 2 Tonnes of CO_2e per annum. This is one of the higher levels and would be even higher if the contribution from oil use was included. Transport contributions will also be high, as most journeys are by private car.						
Likelihood of effects	Given the current reliance on private transport, it is highly likely that further development would lead to more car trips. New development ought to be connected to the national gas and electricity networks, ensuring that new development is not inefficient.						
Significance	Scenario 1 would support a higher amount of growth than identified as the minimum target in the Neighbourhood Plan. This would lead to more car trips and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Given that Billesdon is a Rural Centre with only moderate access to services, a minor negative effect is therefore predicted. The scale of growth associated with Scenario 2 is unlikely to have a significant effect. Scenario 3 is essentially the baseline position established by the Neighbourhood Plan and so neutral effects are predicted.						

Summary of effects for Billesdon

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗✗	✗	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗✗	✗	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	-	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	-
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✓	-	-

Fleckney

Scenarios tested for Fleckney

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Fleckney to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Fleckney. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (525-572 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Five distinct growth scenarios have been determined using both the scale of growth and/or employment provision in Fleckney or nearby Kibworth. Variations in employment provision in Lutterworth are not considered to be a significant factor for Fleckney. Scenario 3 has been subdivided as both 3a and 3b propose a similar amount of housing growth, but scenario 3b involves an SDA at nearby Kibworth, whilst 3b does not. Given the very close links to Kibworth, the significantly increased housing and employment provision ought to have implications in Fleckney. Scenario 4 has been sub divided for the same reasons. For scenario 2, there are two housing options (2 and 4) that involve 3ha of employment in Fleckney. Housing option 5 does not involve employment in Fleckney, but does involve 5 ha at nearby Kibworth. Although 5 ha of employment at Kibworth would generate more jobs than the 3 ha in Fleckney, it is considered that the effect on Fleckney would be similar, given that 3ha in Fleckney itself would be more likely to support communities and businesses locally. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider Housing Options 2, 4, and 5 together under Scenario 2.
2	Moderate-high growth (370-440 dwellings)	2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5	*10 ha*	*4ha*	*5ha*		*22ha*	
3a	Moderate growth (307 dwellings)	6	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23ha*	
3b	Moderate growth (283 dwellings) with local employment	7	*10 ha*	*4ha*	*5ha*	*3 ha*	*24ha*	
4a	Low growth (185 dwellings)	8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23ha*	
4b	Low growth (147-204 dwellings) *with employment provision*	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Fleckney

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✗✗	Scenario 2	✗	Scenario 3a	✗	Scenario 4a	-
					Scenario 3b	✗	Scenario 4b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b and 4a and 4b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 3 and 4 below cover both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such as hedgerows, grassland and trees. Development would also present the potential for greater visitor disturbance to the Grand Union Canal. The effects would be likely to be more pronounced for Scenario 1 due to the higher level of growth, and less likely for scenarios 2, 3 and 4 (least effect), which would involve lower levels of growth. The potential to enhance green infrastructure could be higher for Scenarios involving higher rates of growth. *Environmental quality* - There would be an increasing loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenarios 1 (most loss) to 4 (least loss). Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. This could potentially be an issue for scenarios 1 and 2 which would generate a greater number of trips.								
Sensitivity of receptors	The Grand Union SSSI lies to the East of Fleckney. Areas of land outside the settlement boundary to the East fall within the SSSI risk zone that requires development above 50dwellings to be assessed for potential effects on the SSSI. Within the urban area and surrounding land to the north, south and west, development above 100 dwellings should be assessed. Individually, developments surrounding Fleckney may not trigger this requirement, but there is a potential for cumulative effects. There are areas of land surrounding Fleckney that may have local importance to wildlife. For example, adjacent to Fleckney Brook. Agricultural land surrounding Fleckney is classified as Grade 3. It is considered unlikely that those options involving an SDA at Kibworth (options 5, 7, 9) could have an effect on road traffic through Fleckney. This is because access to services and jobs from an SDA in Kibworth would be more likely to be direct to the A6.								
Likelihood of effects	For scenarios 1 and 2, effects on biodiversity would be likely as there would be a need to release all or most land identified in the SHLAA and/or further land that may come forward through a call for sites. This would need to be on greenfield land, and there would likely be a loss of trees, hedgerows and grassland. Scenario 3 would involve a lower level of growth, so the likelihood of negative effects would be lower than Scenarios 1 and 2, as more sensitive areas could possibly be avoided. Effects under scenario 4 would be likely to be less pronounced still. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land under each of the scenarios, with a greater amount for scenarios 1 and 2 (over 20 hectares in total), and a lesser amount for scenarios 3 and 4. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car could potentially increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges.								

Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 are likely to have negative effects on wildlife due to the scale of development and the need to release all identified SHLAA sites / and or further sites on the settlement edge. Whilst this would not have a direct effect on any designated wildlife sites, it would lead to the loss of local habitat such as hedgerows, trees and grassland. There would also be the potential for cumulative effects on the Grand Union Canal SSSI from increased visitor pressure, which would need to be managed. However, mitigation and enhancement measures would be likely to be secured through plan policies, so the magnitude of effects would be likely to be reduced. Nevertheless, a minor negative effect is predicted for these two scenarios. Scenarios 3 and 4 would also involve the loss of greenfield land, although to a lesser extent than scenarios 1 and 2, so there may be greater scope to mitigate and avoid impacts. This would particularly be the case for Scenario 4, so a neutral effect on biodiversity is predicted for this scenario. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity for Scenario 4, and a neutral effect for scenario 3, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. Although enhancement would also be possible for scenarios 1 and 2, it is considered that the overall loss of open space required to deliver housing would outweigh the potential benefits, and hence a negative effect would remain. There would be a loss of agricultural land under scenarios 1-4, which would be unavoidable. For scenario 1, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil as over 20ha of land would be likely to be lost in total. Although there are negative implications, the effects are not considered to be significant for alternatives 1-4 as the loss of land would be under 20ha (the threshold for consulting with DEFRA on individual developments involving the loss of agricultural land). For scenarios 1-3, there would be likely a noticeable increase in car trips through the village centre, which could have an effect on air quality. The extent of effects is unclear at this stage as traffic modelling has not been undertaken. For scenario 1, the overall effect on natural resources is predicted to be a moderate negative effect to take account of the effects upon soil and biodiversity. For scenarios 2 and 3, the effects on natural resources are predicted to be a minor negative to reflect disturbance and loss of wildlife habitats. Scenario 4 is considered unlikely to have significant effects.

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2	××	Scenario 3a	×	Scenario 4a	-
					Scenario 3b	×	Scenario 4b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b and 4a and 4b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 3 and 4 below cover both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenarios 2, 3 and 4.							
Sensitivity of receptors	Fleckney does not contain a Conservation Area, although it contains 3 listed buildings in the village centre. There are two areas of potential archaeological interest; both are located along the brook, one to the east of the centre and one off Arnesby Road to the west of the village. The capacity for landscape to accommodate change varies around the settlement, with less sensitive areas concentrated to the north, areas of moderate/low sensitivity running alongside Fleckney Brook, and areas of moderate sensitivity focused to the south.							
Likelihood of effects	Due to its proximity, any development on the edge of the settlement would be unlikely to have a direct effect on the listed buildings in the centre of the village. The main effects would be related to the character of the settlement edge. For scenario 1, there would be a need for comprehensive development around Fleckney that could potentially lead to negative effects on the openness of these areas and the approach to the village along roads. The effects would be less pronounced for scenarios 2, 3, and 4. Mitigation and design could be secured to reduce the effects, but this would be more difficult at higher levels of growth, where the demand for land would mean that higher densities or more land would need to be released.							
Significance	Scenario 1 (and to a slightly lesser extent scenario 2) would require substantial development on the edge of the settlement. This would lead to a change in the character of the settlement, which in some areas, there is only moderate-low capacity to change. It would be difficult to avoid these areas if this level of development was proposed, and even though mitigation and design measures would be likely to be secured, new development would change the approach to Fleckney from Kilby Road and Leicester Road. Development may also put additional pressure on car parking in the village centre, which could affect the setting of the built environment. A moderate negative effect is predicted for Scenarios 1 and 2 to reflect the issues discussed above. Scenario 3 would involve a lower housing target, which would mean that lower densities or less development sites need to come forward. It is therefore assumed that the potential for negative effects would be lower than for Scenarios 1 and 2. Nevertheless, a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 4 would involve modest levels of growth. Given the amount of deliverable land, potential effects on landscape ought to be easier to avoid and / or mitigate, through securing lower densities and/or areas of open space / landscape buffers. Therefore, a neutral effect is predicted.							

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3a	✓	Scenario 4a	✓
					Scenario 3b	✓✓	Scenario 4b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-4 would require increased provision of local school and health provision (With a lesser need moving from Scenario 1 to Scenario 4). Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions (again, scenario 1 would have the largest effect and scenario 4 the least). For alternatives that involve an SDA at Nearby Kibworth, access to employment opportunities and housing would also be likely to improve, although this would not be within Fleckney itself.							
Sensitivity of receptors	The primary school has some surplus, and has potential to expand on site. Fleckney is supported by the branch surgeries of the Kibworth practices. There are capacity issues in Kibworth although a new surgery is planned for one of the practices for the existing patients. S106 contributions would be sought to fund a Kibworth surgery extension. There are shortfalls in some types of open space.							
Likelihood of effects	For scenarios 1 (and possibly 2), the amount of growth could potentially support a viable new primary school in Fleckney (assuming a dwelling/pupil ratio of 0.2). This would be positive locally as it would provide greater choice to existing and new residents. For scenario 3, the viability of a new school may not be as favourable, and thus provision would be relied upon by expanding existing schools. The capacity to extend existing schools exists, but there may be a limit to this, and therefore some contributions may go towards provision outside of Fleckney, which is less positive. For alternative 4, the level of development could probably be accommodated through expansion of existing schools. Under each scenario, contributions would be sought to improve health facilities in Kibworth, so effects would be anticipated to be neutral. For Scenario 1, the level of growth may help to support the provision of a new health facility in Kibworth, which would have a positive effect with regards to access to healthcare. However, there is uncertainty regarding this. *It should also be noted that options 5, 7, 9 would involve an SDA at Kibworth, which would also be likely to involve new health facilities.* For scenarios 1-4 it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision, which could help to address any identified shortages in Fleckney.							
Significance	Scenario 1 is predicted to have a moderate positive effect on health and wellbeing as it would help to provide housing in Fleckney, as well as the potential for new education facilities locally, that would reduce the need to travel to Kibworth. Scenario 2 would have similar effects, although the potential for a local primary school would be more uncertain. Scenario 3 would have a positive effect with regards to housing, and infrastructure improvements, although this would be on a lesser scale and education provision would be likely to be delivered in Kibworth. Scenario 4 is predicted to have a neutral effect, as there would be limited effects on school capacity, but only a modest amount of housing growth – and thus less potential to deliver affordable housing and community infrastructure upgrades. Scenarios 3b and 4b ought to have a slightly more positive effect on health and wellbeing by improved access to jobs at an SDA in Kibworth, although it is only likely these effects would be experienced at the later part of the Plan period.							

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	✗	Scenario 2	✗	Scenario 3a	-	Scenario 4a	-
					Scenario 3b	-	Scenario 4b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b and 4a and 4b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 3 and 4 below cover both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 - 4, which would require the development of greenfield land. Although plan policies would seek to limit surface water run-off into the sewer system (Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy), but this would not ensure that there was no net increase in run off. Therefore, there could be the potential for cumulative effects on flood risk locally where higher levels of development are proposed.							
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood zones 2 and 3 are identified around Fleckney Brook and are located close to two sites included in the SHLAA. Surface water flooding may also present a risk throughout the settlement.							
Likelihood of effects	The majority of land surrounding Fleckney is not at risk of flooding and hence effects would be unlikely in this respect for each Scenario. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs. However, the intention is to '*minimise the net increase in surface water run-off discharged to sewers'*, which means that an increase might be anticipated in some areas.							
Significance	The level of development on greenfield land associated with scenarios 1 and 2 would be likely to lead to an increase in surface water run-off. Although plan policies would seek to manage the impacts and incorporate SUDs, there is potential for a cumulative negative effect on local flood risk from surface water. For scenarios 3 and 4, the level of development would be lower, and thus the effects are predicted to be less significant.							

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3a	✓	Scenario 4a	✓
					Scenario 3b	✓✓	Scenario 4b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-4 would deliver housing, helping to support local provision of affordable and market homes to meet needs. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the village. For Scenarios 1 and 2, the level of growth would be high, and would likely attract a higher level of in-migration compared to scenarios 3 and 4. For alternatives that involve an SDA at Nearby Kibworth, access to employment opportunities and housing would also be likely to improve, although this would not be within Fleckney itself.							
Sensitivity of receptors	House prices are relatively affordable compared to other Rural Centres. Fleckney has a young population profile, which could continue to create a need for housing to support young people and families (*Population increased by 6.5% between 2001 and 2011 and the number of dwellings by 9.1% over the same period of time).* Fleckney is relatively well off with respect to existing employment provision compared to the other rural centres. There is potential to enhance and increase employment provision locally, and good road links to the Leicester Urban Area and Market Harborough.							
Likelihood of effects	The SHLAA includes sufficient deliverable land to deliver the housing target set out in Scenario 4 (and just about for Scenario 3). For Scenarios 3 and 4, there is uncertainty about the delivery of the full housing targets for Scenarios 1 and 2, as further land not identified in the SHLAA would need to come forward and/or land only available in the longer term. It is likely that residents would use local shops and services, and the level of growth under Scenarios 1 and 2 would provide opportunities for new or expanded shops and services to be developed. Scenarios 3 and 4 would also support the local economy but to a lesser extent compared to Scenarios 1 and 2.							
Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) would deliver a high level of housing in an area that is attractive to families and has young population profile. This ought to help maintain growth in the settlement and allow local residents to remain in the village if they wish to. The level of growth would also support the vitality of the local economy, potentially supporting new shops and services. There would be a moderate positive effect for both scenarios. . Scenario 3 and to a lesser extent Scenario 4 would also help to support local housing, which in turn would have positive effects on the local village economy. The provision of housing under scenario 4 would be fairly low compared to previous rates of growth, thus the effects would only be minor. However, for options that include an SDA at Kibworth (3b and 4b) these effects could be somewhat offset and thus a moderate positive effect is predicted.							

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	✗	Scenario 2	✗	Scenario 3a	-	Scenario 4a	-
					Scenario 3b	-	Scenario 4b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b and 4a and 4b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 3 and 4 below cover both sub-options.* Scenarios 1-4 would be likely to lead to increased road trips with associated greenhouse gas emissions. New development will lead to an overall increase in energy and water use in Fleckney. However, this would be the case wherever development was located.							
Sensitivity of receptors	Fleckney contributes some 1.8 Tonnes per person of CO2 emissions from domestic electricity and gas consumption (based on 2011 data). The majority of homes have access to mains gas. The settlement is reasonable well served by daytime bus services, but there is no local train station.							
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available in Fleckney, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Fleckney and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.							
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 and 2 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Fleckney; which as a rural centre, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under these two scenarios would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district. Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenarios 3 and 4 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Fleckney. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. neutral).							

Summary of effects for Fleckney

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3a	Scenario 3b	Scenario 4a	Scenario 4b
Natural Environment SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✘✘	✘	✘	✘	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✘✘	✘✘	✘	✘	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	✘	✘	-	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✘	✘	-	-	-	-

Great Glen

Scenarios tested for Great Glen

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Great Glen to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Great Glen. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate growth (166 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	For some strategic housing options employment provision would be made at Kibworth SDA. As Great Glen is only 5km away and a 10 minute bus ride, it is likely that residents in Great Glen could benefit from employment opportunities. Therefore, although Scenario 3a and 3b involve the same level of housing growth, they have been separated to reflect the presence or absence of Kibworth SDA.
2	Low growth (64 dwellings)	2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
3a	Very low / no growth (0-25 dwellings)	3, 4 6, 8	*10 ha*	*4 ha* *10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha* *23 ha*	
3b	Very low / no growth (0-17 dwellings) with SDA	5, 7 9	*10 ha*	*4 ha* *10 ha*	*5 ha*	*3 ha*	*22 ha* *28 ha*	

**Excludes Magna Park*

SA findings for Great Glen

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For natural environment, there would be no different effects for Scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such as hedgerows, grassland and trees. The effects would be likely to be more pronounced for Scenario 1 due to the higher level of growth. There would be no effect on biodiversity with scenario 3 as none or very little growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity and green infrastructure under this alternative. Conversely, the potential to enhance green infrastructure could be higher for Scenarios involving higher rates of growth, particularly on agricultural land. *Environmental quality* - There would be a loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent scenario 2 and 3. Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no designated sites within close proximity to Great Glen. Great Glen falls into one of the outer isochrones for the SSSI risk impact zones for Kilby Foxton Canal. Residential development over 100 dwellings in this area is required to be consulted upon. There are features of local wildlife interest that could be affected by new development such as field margins, hedges and trees. However, there may be potential to enhance some areas of open space and land that. Agricultural land surrounding Great Glen is classified as Grade 2. Further transport evidence is needed to look into how much additional traffic the A6 into Oadby & Wigston and Leicester City can accommodate.						
Likelihood of effects	For scenarios 1, effects on biodiversity would be likely as there would be a need to develop greenfield land, and there would likely be a loss of trees, hedgerows and grassland. Scenario 2 would involve a lower level of growth, so the likelihood of negative effects would be lower as more sensitive areas could possibly be avoided. At present, no land has been identified as available in the short term, so development would be more likely to occur towards the end of the plan period. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car could potentially increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges. It is unlikely that the trips generated through Scenario 2 would be substantial.						
Significance	Scenario 1 would lead to housing development with potential for negative effects on local wildlife. Although mitigation and enhancement ought to be secured, a minor negative effect is predicted on natural resources, as there would also be a permanent loss of agricultural land and a minor increase in emissions and congestion associated with car travel. Scenario 2 would involve a smaller scale of growth, so effects are considered to be insignificant. Scenario 3 would have a neutral effect as it involves little or no growth.						

	Should enhancement measures be secured, there is potential for positive effects associated with Scenario 1 and 2, but at this stage these effects cannot be guaranteed.

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	**Scenario 1**	✘	**Scenario 2**	-	**Scenario 3a**	-
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For built and natural heritage, there would be no different effects for Scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most notable for Scenario 1, which involves a higher level of development.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Great Glen does not contain a Conservation Area, although there is an aspiration to establish one. There are 25 listed buildings, and 2 known sites of archaeological importance. Several heritage assets fall within areas at risk of flooding. The capacity for landscape to accommodate change is largely categorised as 'medium' 'medium-low', although there are areas of 'high' or 'medium high' capacity over the border in Oadby.					
Likelihood of effects	Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an effect on the character of the settlement. However, the small scale of growth ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated.					
Significance	Scenario 1 could lead to negative effects upon built and natural heritage through development on the edge of the settlement. The effects are considered to be minor, as the level of growth is not significant compared to the scale of the settlement and the historic rate of population growth between 2001-2011 (14%). It should also be possible to avoid sensitive areas and mitigate potential impacts. Scenario 2 would involve a small level of growth and is not considered likely to have a significant effect on built or natural heritage. Scenario 3 would not involve any growth and thus a neutral effect is predicted.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	✘
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent) Scenario 2 would require increased provision of local school and health provision, but this might be difficult to provide locally. Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions. Under scenario 3a/3b, there would be limited growth, which would be less supportive of the delivery of market and affordable housing. This would have a negative effect on local communities that wish to live/remain in Great Glen. This Scenario would not put as much pressure on local health and educational facilities, but it wouldn't provide opportunities for the enhancement of open space and community infrastructure as there would be fewer developer contributions secured. Scenario 3b ought to improve opportunities for employment for residents in Great Glen as there would be provision of 5 ha of employment land as part of an SDA at Kibworth, as well as the 3 ha at Fleckney (common to all 9 housing options).					
Sensitivity of receptors	The primary school site is confined and is reaching capacity. Great Glen does not fall into an area of high deprivation. Nevertheless, healthcare facilities are at capacity and need to be expanded to support the current population and any further growth in people. There are also shortfalls in some types of open space. Population and housing growth between 2001-2011(13.7%) is slightly higher than the District average.					
Likelihood of effects	For scenarios 1 and 2 the amount of growth proposed would be unlikely to support a viable new primary school (assuming a dwelling/pupil ratio of 0.2). Given that the capacity to expand the current school is constrained, it is likely that provision would need to be met elsewhere to meet the growth in population. Scenario 3 would not have an effect on school provision. Under scenario 1 and 2, contributions would be sought to improve health facilities in Great Glen, so effects would be anticipated to be positive. For alternative 3, there would be no support through developer contributions for health facilities, which would not help to address existing issues. For scenarios 1 and 2 it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision, which could help to address any identified shortages. These opportunities would be lower for Scenario 3a/3b.					
Significance	Scenario 1 and 2 would increase housing provision locally, having a positive effect on health and wellbeing in the long term (deliverable land has not yet been identified in the short term). Development would also help to support the viability the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. These effects are considered to be moderately positive, given that the historic level of growth between 2001 and 2011 suggests that Great Glen is an attractive place for residents. However, for both scenarios, the increased population would put pressure on primary schools that would be unlikely to be resolved locally. Consequently, access to a primary school for some residents would be poor, and could increase car travel. For these reasons, the overall effect for both scenarios is considered to be less positive; thus only minor positive effect is predicted for scenario 1. Scenarios 3a and 3b support no or low levels of growth in Great Glen; which may affect the availability of housing, and would not support aspirations for improved infrastructure in the village. Although community identity would be preserved in the short term, there could be a decline in the housing offer in the longer term, which may affect community identity. A lack of development would also limit opportunities to support healthcare improvements and enhancements to community infrastructure. Conversely, this option would not put as much pressure on local school services; which ought to ensure that new residents do not have to travel to access education. On balance, a minor negative effect is predicted for 3a. A neutral effect is predicted for 3b, as the SDA at Kibworth ought to provide better access to jobs and housing which might offset the lower levels of growth in Great Glen to an extent.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)						
	Scenario 1	✘	**Scenario 2**	-	**Scenario 3a**	-
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For resilience, there would be no different effects for Scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* Although the sequential and exception tests would need to be applied, there is potential for development to be located in areas that are close to or within areas at risk of flooding. There is also potential for development to increase areas of impermeable land, which could contribute to increased surface water run-off.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are areas of fluvial flood risk running through Great Glen. Surface water flooding may be a localised issue, but this has not been established.					
Likelihood of effects	The sequential test would need to be applied to ensure that land at risk of flooding was not developed inappropriately. SUDs would also be sought to help to manage surface water run-off. Nevertheless, the potential for development to be at risk of or contribute to flood risk remains an issue in Great Glen that would need to be explored in greater detail. The scale of housing development for Scenarios 2 and 3 would mean that development was more unlikely to have an effect on resilience to climate change.					
Significance	Scenario 1 has the potential to lead to development in areas at risk of flooding. However, the range of sites available for development ought to ensure that suitable alternatives could be found to deliver this level of growth. Nevertheless, a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 to reflect the precautionary principle. The level of growth associated with Scenario 2 would be low, and it ought to be possible to avoid constrained land and minimise contribution to surface water run-off. Consequently, a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 2. Scenario 3 would lead to very low or no development, and thus a neutral effect would occur. However, the potential to secure SUDs schemes on new developments would be lower (and hence the potential to help achieve a net decrease in surface water run-off in the settlement).					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)		Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3a	✘✘
						Scenario 3b	✘
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would support the development of housing growth in Great Glen. Whilst this is still modest in the context of the settlements size, it could help to increase housing provision locally, having a positive effect on meeting needs and supporting the local economy. Scenario 2 would have the same effects albeit on a much smaller scale. Scenario 3a/3b would not support much housing growth in Great Glen which could perpetuate affordable housing issues, and lead to increased out-migration in the longer term. 3b would offset these effects to an extent by providing housing choice at Kibworth SDA as well as improved employment opportunities.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Between 2001 and 2011 there was a population increase of 14% in Great Glen, which is slightly higher than the District average.						
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient land in the SHLAA to meet the housing numbers under each scenario.						
Significance	The level of growth under scenario 1 would help to provide market and affordable housing in and around Great Glen over the Plan period. The level of growth is fairly modest compared to growth between 2001 and 2011, and so a minor positive effect is predicted. For scenario 2, the level of growth would be low, and would only support limited housing in Great Glen. The housing provision would likely be less than population growth, and so there could be negative effects as some people might have to move away. This low level of growth would also not help to support the growth of local businesses, and hence a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 3a would allow for very low growth in Great Glen, which would have a moderate negative effect by limiting opportunities to access affordable housing, and limiting increased local spending in the village. The effects for 3b are offset to an extent by the provision of housing and employment at nearby Kibworth, but a minor negative effect still remains.						

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	✓
						Scenario 3b	✓
Nature of effects	Additional development under Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 could lead to increased use of resources through the need for energy and water in new development, and the generation of increased car trips. The effects would be small scale, as the growth involved is not substantial under any scenario.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Great Glen has a relatively high figure for carbon emissions per person from domestic gas and electricity consumption (based on 2011 data), at 2.3 tonnes per person. Almost 10% of households rely on electric heating, causing higher emissions, but also increasing the risk of fuel poverty. There are also a significant number of homes reliant on oil; these emissions are not reflected in these figures. Great Glen also has a high proportion of detached homes, which may have higher heating needs.						
Likelihood of effects	Although access to mains gas and electricity is limited for some properties, it ought to be available for new development. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Great Glen and any new development would be unlikely to change this. There are reasonable bus services into Leicester and Market Harborough, but the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue at least in the short term.						
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Great Glen; which as a rural centre, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, constituting a minor negative effect. However, the level of growth is only moderate, and this might be expected to come forward anyway in the absence of a Plan (i.e. housing would be determined against the NPPF with a presumption in favour of sustainable development). Each of these scenarios actually represents fairly low to moderate growth, and so the effect on emissions is considered to be neutral. Scenarios 3a and 3b would not lead to further greenhouse gas emissions from Great Glen and growth would be delivered at SDAs or larger settlements (i.e. Market Harborough) that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. Overall, scenarios 3a and 3b ought to contribute to a slight reduction in greenhouse gas emissions across the district, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted. **Recommendation:** Development in Great Glen should be connected to the gas and electricity networks, and where possible seek to improve connectivity for those dwellings that are reliant upon oil and electric heating.						

Summary of effects for Great Glen

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3a	Scenario 3b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	×	-	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	-	×	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	×	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓	×	××	×
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	✓	✓

Houghton on the Hill

Scenarios tested for Houghton on the Hill

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Houghton on the Hill to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Houghton on the Hill. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (130-172 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	There are variations in employment provision for the options grouped under scenario 2 (options 4, 5,6 ,7) and scenario 3 (options 3, 8, 9). However, it is likely that the effects of employment provision on Houghton on the Hill would be the same regardless of variations in employment land provision across the 9 housing options. This is because access to jobs from Houghton on the Hill would be expected to mainly be in Leicester or other key employment areas, and additional employment provision in Lutterworth and/or Kibworth would be less likely to be accessed/beneficial to communities in Houghton on the Hill. Therefore, variations in land provision at these SDAs would not affect the appraisal findings under scenarios 2 and 3.
2	Moderate-high growth (81-112 dwellings)	4,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7		*4 ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
		6		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
3	Low growth (41-57 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*	-		*23ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28ha*	

**Excludes Strategic Distribution Sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such as hedgerows, grassland and trees. Development would also present the potential for greater visitor disturbance to the Grand Union Canal. The effects would be likely to be more pronounced for Scenario 1 due to the higher level of growth, and less likely for scenarios 2 and 3, which would involve lower levels of growth. The potential to enhance green infrastructure could be higher for Scenarios involving higher rates of growth. *Environmental quality* - There would be an increasing loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3. Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. This could potentially be an issue for scenarios 1 and 2 which would generate a greater number of trips locally. Low levels of development would occur for Scenario 3, so local effects on air quality would be unlikely. Some of the options within Scenarios 2 and 3 would involve an SDA in the surrounding area, which could lead to increased trips in the A47, potentially affecting air quality in Houghton on the Hill.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no SSSIs or European sites within close proximity to Houghton on the Hill, and land around the settlement edge does not fall within any SSSI impact risk zones. There are no designated local wildlife sites, although some potentially developable sites contain hedges, trees and are adjacent to Bushby Brook, so there is the potential for effects on local wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Houghton on the Hill is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land under each of the scenarios, with a greater amount for scenarios 1 and 2, and a lesser amount for scenario 3. It is unlikely that the total loss of agricultural land under the highest rate of growth (Scenario 1) would be above 10hectares. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car could potentially increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges. There would also be a likely increase in trips to Leicester and other large settlements (e.g. Peterborough) to seek employment. The likelihood of this affecting congestion along the A47 has not been modelled, but it is unlikely that Scenario 3 would have an effect due to the low level of growth anticipated. Having said this, the development of an SDA in the Leicester urban area would be the alternative to low growth in the rural centres for options 4, 7, 8 . So effects on air quality may be an issue for these options.					
Significance	Biodiversity is unlikely to be significantly affected at lower levels of growth, as the sensitivity of the surrounding areas is relatively low, and mitigation ought to be secured for new developments. At this level of growth, it also ought to be possible to avoid areas of importance for local wildlife. However, for Scenarios 1 and 2, it would be necessary for both deliverable sites identified in the SHLAA and/or further potential development sites to be brought forward. Some of the remaining land around the settlement is within sensitive landscape that has value for wildlife (i.e. to the South East of Houghton on the Hill), and therefore it would potentially need to be developed under scenario 1 and 2. This could have a minor negative effect on wildlife by breaking up fields that are bordered by trees and hedgerows.					

	There would be a loss of agricultural land under scenarios 1-3, which would be unavoidable. However, the total amount of land that would be lost is anticipated to be lower than 10 hectares in total for Scenario 1, and lesser still for Scenarios 2 and 3. For scenarios 1-3, there would be an increase in car trips along the A47, which could contribute to congestion. The extent of effects is unclear at this stage as traffic modelling has not been undertaken. However, it is reasonable to assume that Scenario 1 would be most likely to have a negative effect and Scenario 3 would have a more neutral effect. For scenario 1, the overall effect on the natural environment is predicted to be a minor negative effect to take account of the effects upon soil, biodiversity and air quality. Scenario 2 would have a lesser effect than Scenario 1, but it is still considered to be a minor negative. The low levels of growth under Scenario 3 constitute a neutral effect on natural resources (but the potential for effects on air quality along the A47 could affect Houghton on the Hill due to the development of an SDA close to Leicester under options (4, 7, 8).

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	✘✘✘	Scenario 2	✘✘	Scenario 3	✘
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenarios 2, 3 and 4.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Houghton on the Hill contains a Conservation Area covering the southern part of the village and surrounding fields to the South East. There are 21 Listed buildings falling within this area. There are four areas of potential archaeological interest; two off the A47 and two to the south of the settlement. The capacity for landscape to accommodate change is low. In general terms it is unlikely to be able to accommodate development without significant degradation of the existing landscape character.						
Likelihood of effects	At higher levels of growth it is possible that development could take place in areas of sensitive landscape (*given that there are limited alternatives around the settlement (some sites have been ruled as undeliverable, whilst other areas have not yet been proposed*). Mitigation measures are unlikely to be able to address adverse landscape impacts in some areas, particularly to the South East.						
Significance	For Scenario 1, it is possible that development could take place in areas of sensitive landscape (*given that there are limited alternatives around the settlement (some sites have been ruled as undeliverable, whilst other areas have not yet been proposed*). This would have a major negative effect on the character of Houghton on the Hill, particularly, as this either falls within and / or contributes to the setting of the Conservation Area. Development in locations to the north and south (not yet proposed for development) also present potential effects in terms of archaeology, but there ought to be potential to mitigate such effects. The effects are similar for Scenario 2, but on a lesser scale, and hence only a moderate negative effect is predicted. A minor negative effect is predicted for scenario 3, as it would involve a level of growth that would make it easier to avoid the most sensitive areas, and it would also limit the spread of the settlement. Nevertheless, landscape surrounding the settlement is sensitive in all directions, and thus a minor negative effect is still predicted.						

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-3 would require increased provision of local school and health provision (With a lesser need moving from Scenario 1 to Scenario 3). Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions (again, scenario 1 would have the largest effect and scenario 3 the least).					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 1524 (decrease of 24 or 1.6% since 2001, compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over the same period). Conversely, there has been an increase in dwellings and households. There is no GP, but development would impact upon Billesdon GP practice and contributions towards improvements would be sought. There is limited on-site capacity for the primary school to expand. Houghton on the hill has very low levels of deprivation.					
Likelihood of effects	For scenarios 1-3, there will be a need to provide for additional pupils. The level of development under any of these Scenarios would be unlikely to support a viable new school in Houghton on the Hill and thus provision would be relied upon by expanding the existing school. There is limited capacity to expand the existing school on site though, and thus it is likely that provision would need to be made elsewhere, particularly for Scenario 1 and 2. Under each scenario, contributions would be sought to improve health facilities (likely in Billesdon), so effects would be anticipated to be neutral. For scenarios 1-3 it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision and / or community facilities, which could help to address any identified shortages.					
Significance	Scenarios 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2, support residents to remain in Houghton on the Hill by providing new market and affordable housing. Although there is not a pressing need to tackle deprivation in this area, this level of growth would help to provide affordable housing to local communities, and would also help to support community infrastructure. However, increased growth would require contributions to school provision, which would probably not be provided locally. This would mean that new development would not be well located in terms of access to a primary school. For this reason, Scenarios 1 and 2 are only predicted to have a minor positive effect overall. Scenario 3 would have a positive effect on local housing provision (and for option 8, this would also include further growth in the Leicester urban area through an SDA). The level of growth would help to reduce the population decline slightly, and it might be possible to support this low level of growth at the existing primary school. A minor positive effect is predicted.					

Husbands Bosworth

Scenarios tested for Husbands Bosworth

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Husbands Boworth to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Husbands Bosworth. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate – High growth (68-99 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Husbands Bosworth. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in Husbands Bosworth in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Husbands Bosworth as they are some distance away.
2a	Low – moderate (16-55 dwellings)	3,4,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*15 ha*	
		5,7			*5 h*		*22 ha*	
2b	Low moderate with SDA	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2a	✘	Scenario 2b	✘
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such as hedgerows, grassland and trees. The effects would be likely to be more pronounced for Scenario 1 due to the higher level of growth. There would be minimal effect on biodiversity with scenario 2b as no growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity and green infrastructure under this alternative. Conversely, the potential to enhance green infrastructure could be higher for Scenarios involving higher rates of growth, particularly on agricultural land. *Environmental quality* - There would be a loss of land classified as Grade 3 or Grade 2 under Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent scenario 2. Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. The scale of growth is not substantial though even for the higher end of scenario 1. Development presents the possibility of pollution to groundwater.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no designated sites within close proximity to Husbands Bosworth. Husbands Bosworth falls into one of the outer isochrones for the SSSI risk impact zones for Bosworth Mill Meadow. However, residential development is not required to be assessed in this zone, so it is assumed that the risk from new housing development is deemed to be insignificant. There are features of local wildlife interest that could be affected by new development such as field margins and trees. However, there may be potential to enhance some areas of open space and land that is currently used for agriculture. Agricultural land surrounding Husbands Bosworth is classified as Grade 3, but there are pockets of Grade 2 land adjacent to the settlement boundary to the South. Two sites identified as deliverable in the SHLAA fall into this area of Grade 2 land. Groundwater Protection Zones are located in close proximity to the settlement.					
Likelihood of effects	For scenarios 1 and 2a, effects on biodiversity would be likely as there would be a need to release greenfield land, with likely loss of trees, hedgerows and grassland. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, with a greater amount for Scenario 1 (over 20 hectares in total). Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car could potentially increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges. New development would not be permitted in Groundwater Protection Zones without an assessment of potential impacts.					

Significance	Scenario 2 would lead to a level of growth that could be accommodated within sites identified as deliverable in the draft SHLAA (2015). Assuming these sites were developed, there would be a loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, which constitutes a minor negative effect. Effects on biodiversity are predicted to be neutral, as the sensitivity of potential sites is assumed to be low, and there ought to be potential for enhancement given that much of the land is in agricultural use. Scenario 1 would require a higher level of growth than Scenario 2, which would mean that further land would need to be released. As per Scenario 2, there would be a loss of agricultural land which constitutes a minor negative effect. Although the scale of growth would be slightly higher, the effects on biodiversity are not predicted to be more significant for Scenario 1, as mitigation and enhancement ought to be possible. The effects on Groundwater are not considered likely to be significant as development would not take place within these areas.

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	**Scenario 1**	**×**	**Scenario 2a**	**-**	**Scenario 2b**	**-**
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Husbands Bosworth contains a Conservation Area, with 28 listed Buildings and 1 Ancient Monument. There are no areas of potential archaeological interest within close proximity to the settlement. The capacity for landscape to accommodate change is largely categorised as 'medium' in the areas with the potential for development. Approaching the village from the North along the A5199, the landscape is slightly elevated and development would be prominent.					
Likelihood of effects	Due to its proximity, any development on the edge of the settlement would be unlikely to have a direct effect on the listed buildings in the centre of the village. However, development could be adjacent to the Conservation Area boundaries, and so its character could be affected at the settlement edge. For Scenario 1, land would need to be developed in areas of medium capacity to change. This would be likely to include development on sensitive land on the approach to the village, and / or to plan for higher densities. The effects would be less pronounced for Scenario 2 as a lower level of growth would be required; potentially allowing for more sensitive areas to be avoided.					

Significance	Scenario 1 would require development on the edge of the settlement. This would lead to a change in the character of the settlement, which is categorised as having only moderate capacity to change. Under this scenario, it would be more difficult to avoid sensitive areas, and despite mitigation measures a minor negative effect is predicted to reflect this. Scenario 2 involves a lower level of growth, which would mean that less development sites would need to be allocated. Although there would still be some change to the character of the settlement, it ought to be possible to avoid the most sensitive areas, and to plan for lower densities that are more sympathetic with the open, rural landscape. Consequently, a neutral effect is predicted. **Recommendation:** Development ought to respect the approaches into the village, particularly adjacent to the A5199 (particularly to the North), and A4304 which act as the 'gateways' to the village.

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	**Scenario 1**	✓	**Scenario 2a**	✓	**Scenario 2b**	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent) Scenario 2 would require increased provision of local school and health provision, but this might be difficult to provide locally. Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions. Under scenario 3, there would be no growth at all, which would not support the delivery of market or affordable housing. This would have a negative effect on local communities that wish to live/remain in Great Glen. This Scenario would not put pressure on local health and educational facilities, but it wouldn't provide opportunities for the enhancement of open space and community infrastructure as there would be no developer contributions secured.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The primary school is at capacity and has no potential to expand on site. A number of surrounding villages such as North and South Kilworth may be reliant upon accessing schools and health facilities in Husbands Bosworth. Husbands Bosworth does not fall into an area of high deprivation. Nevertheless, healthcare facilities are at capacity and need to be expanded to support the current population and any further growth in people. There are also shortfalls in some types of open space. Population and housing growth between 2001-2011 was relatively high compared to the District average.					
Likelihood of effects	For all scenarios the amount of growth proposed would be unlikely to support a viable new primary school (assuming a dwelling/pupil ratio of 0.2). Given that the capacity to expand the current school is constrained, it is likely that provision would need to be met elsewhere to meet the growth in population. Under each Scenario contributions would be sought to improve health facilities so effects would be anticipated to be positive. For each scenario it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision, which could help to address any identified shortages. The effects would be more pronounced for Scenario 1.					

Significance	Scenario 1 and 2a/2b would increase housing provision locally, having a positive effect on health and wellbeing in the medium to long term. Development would also help to support the viability the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. These effects are considered to be moderately positive, given that the historic level of growth between 2001 and 2011 suggests that Husbands Bosworth is an attractive place for residents. However, for these scenarios, the increased population would put pressure on primary schools that would be unlikely to be resolved local. It should be noted that increased demand from surrounding settlements in North Kilworth and South Kilworth (under high growth Options that correspond with Scenario 1 for Husbands Bosworth) would also need to be met in Husbands Bosworth. This could increase the viability of a new primary school, but this is not assured as the critical mass to support a viable facility may not be achieved. Consequently, access to a primary school for some residents could be poor, and could increase car travel. For these reasons, the overall effect for each scenario is considered to be less positive; thus a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2b would involve an SDA at Lutterworth, which may help to improve access to housing and employment opportunities, which ought to have a positive effect on health for residents in Husbands Bosworth.

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	**Scenario 1**	**-**	**Scenario 2a**	**-**	**Scenario 2b**	**-**
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and 2a/2b. The level of development proposed is fairly low under each scenario.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no areas at risk of fluvial flooding. Surface water flooding may present a risk throughout the settlement.					
Likelihood of effects	The majority of land surrounding Husbands Bosworth is not at risk of fluvial flooding and hence effects would be unlikely in this respect for each Scenario. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. However, the total level of development proposed under each scenario is only small.					
Significance	The level of development on greenfield land associated with Scenarios 1 and 2 have the potential to lead to an increase in surface water run-off. However, given the small scale of development, the effects are considered to be neutral.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a/2b) would deliver housing in Husbands Bosworth, helping to improve housing choice and affordability. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the village. Scenario 2b would have additional benefits in terms of improved access to jobs at an SDA in Lutterworth.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Husbands Bosworth GP practice would be unable to manage any increase in patient numbers and a new surgery is needed. S106 contributions towards a new surgery would be sought. The primary school has no current capacity and does not have the capacity to extend. S106 contributions towards primary education would be sought. Appropriate S106 contributions would be sought where a shortfall in certain types of open space is identified. Husbands Bosworth has 5 out of the 6 key services identified in the Core Strategy, which means access to services is fairly good.					
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient land capacity identified in the draft SHLAA 2015 to deliver housing under all scenarios.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1 would have a positive effect on delivering housing (including the provision of affordable housing) in Husbands Bosworth. Homes would also be well related to employment opportunities and ought to support the vitality of the local village. Higher levels of development would put pressure on school provision, but conversely ought to be positive in terms of providing greater demand for a new school (which would be more viable with higher demand). On balance a moderate positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2a would provide a lower amount of growth than Scenario 1, and so positive effects are predicted only to be minor. Scenario 2b would also provide lower housing growth, but would involve an SDA at Lutterworth which would provide alternative housing choice (albeit not in Husbands Bosworth itself) and would also enhance employment opportunities. Consequently, the overall effect of Scenario 2b is predicted to be a moderate positive.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	Both Scenarios would be likely to lead to increased road trips with associated greenhouse gas emissions. New development will lead to an overall increase in energy and water use in Husbands Bosworth. However, this would be the case wherever development was located and national standards would ensure that energy and water efficiency targets were delivered.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Husbands Bosworth contributes 1.4 Tonnes per person of CO2 emissions from domestic electricity and gas consumption (based on 2011 data). However, over half of all households are reliant on oil for heating and the contributions are thus not captured in these figures. In addition over 10% of homes have electric heating, which not only leads to higher emissions, but also contributes to a higher risk of householders falling into fuel poverty. The settlement is reasonable well served by daytime bus services, but there is no local train station.						
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Husbands Bosworth and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.						
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Husbands Bosworth; which as a Rural Centre, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this Scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district, which constitutes a minor negative effect. Scenario 2 would lead to further greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel to and from Husbands Bosworth, but this would be at a level anticipated to occur in the absence of the Plan (i.e. the effects would be neutral). **Recommendation:** Development in Husbands Bosworth should be connected to the gas and electricity networks, and where possible seek to improve connectivity for those dwellings that are reliant upon oil and electric heating.						

Summary of effects for Husbands Bosworth

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗	✗	✗
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✗	-	-

Kibworth

Scenarios tested for Kibworth

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Kibworth to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Kibworth. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Very High growth at an SDA in Kibworth (1200 Dwellings)	5, 7	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3ha*	*22 ha*	Scenario 1 involves different levels of employment in Lutterworth for Options 7 and 5 (4 ha) and Option 9 (10 ha). However, it was not considered necessary to sub-divide Scenario 1, as this involves an SDA at Kibworth, which would have a more significant effect on communities in Kibworth than any variation in employment at Lutterworth. Scenario 3 also involves variations in employment provision at Lutterworth, these are considered unlikely to have a different effect on communities in Kibworth which are over 20km away.
		9		*10 ha*			*28 ha*	
2	Moderate growth (208 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
3	Low / no growth (0-56 dwellings)	2, 3, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		6, 8		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✗✗	Scenario 2	✗	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Development may offer the opportunities to enhance biodiversity, particularly at a strategic development area. There would be no effect on natural resources with scenario 3 as very limited or no growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Agricultural land surrounding Kibworth is classified as Grade 3. There are no SSSIs or Local Wildlife Sites within or adjacent to Kibworth. However there may be habitats of local value and species such as bats and badgers have been recorded. There are also TPOS present that could be affected.					
Likelihood of effects	The loss of agricultural land would be inevitable, as development sites are greenfield and classified as Grade 3. Effects on biodiversity would be dependant upon the scale of development and the mitigation and enhancement measures secured. At this stage, there is uncertainty about what measures would be proposed.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would lead to a substantial loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. The loss and disturbance to local wildlife habitats and potentially protected trees is predicted to have a negative effect. Whilst there may be opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, this is not definitive at this stage, and thus a negative effect is predicted. Overall, a moderate negative effect is predicted on the natural environment for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would involve much lower levels of growth compared to Scenario 1, but would still lead to the loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats such as trees and hedges. A minor negative effect is predicted. The levels of growth under Scenario 3 are very low, and thus a neutral effect on the natural environment is predicted. **Recommendation** - The loss of agricultural land could be offset somewhat through the provision of community allotments as part of the SDA.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	×××	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenario 2, and not an issue at all for Scenario 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are 37 Listed Buildings in Kibworth including a Grade 1 listed Old House and Garden Walls on 33 Main Street. The capacity for landscape to accommodate change varies around Kibworth from 'low' to 'medium low' to the north east, 'medium high' to the west and 'medium'-'medium low' to the south.					
Likelihood of effects	Precise effects on landscape are difficult to predict as it is unknown which SDA would come forward under Scenario 1. However the scale of development would be significant, and would lead to a major change in the overall form of the settlement. There are also areas of sensitive landscape in both proposed SDAs. Mitigation and enhancement ought to be a feature of an SDA, and also for smaller developments, which could offset effects to an extent.					
Significance	A major negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 due to the loss of sensitive landscape and the significant scale of growth involved. Mitigation measures could reduce this effect, but this has not been taken into account at this stage. The effects for Scenario 2 would be less pronounced compared to Scenario 1, and it ought to be possible to avoid the most sensitive sites given the lower scale of growth proposed. Therefore, only minor negative effects are predicted. Scenario 3 would lead to low levels of growth and thus a neutral effect is predicted.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Increased housing and employment ought to have a positive effect on wellbeing by improving choice and affordability and access to a job. Development could put pressure on local facilities, but at higher levels may also create the critical mass needed to support viable new facilities. Development ought to improve community infrastructure through contributions to open space enhancement.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is insufficient capacity to manage increased growth at Kibworth GP practices. A new GP surgery is proposed in Kibworth for one of the practices for the existing patients. However the second practice in Kibworth is unable to manage an increase in demand within existing infrastructure. S106 contributions would be sought for an extension to the existing surgery premises. The primary school, 11-16 and post 16 educational establishments have no capacity to meet dwelling growth. S106 contributions towards school extensions would be sought for primary and other educational provision. Appropriate S106 contributions would be sought where a shortfall in certain types of open space is identified. There is a need for additional evidence to determine how much further traffic the A6 can accommodate and its impacts on Oadby & Wigston and Leicester City. The Council is working with the Highway Authority to put in place the appropriate evidence. This up to date evidence will impact on the amount of development which can take place along the A6 including the Kibworths.					
Likelihood of effects	The deliverability of an SDA is yet to be tested in detail. Contributions to infrastructure enhancement would be secured through development.					
Significance	Scenario 1 is predicted to have a major positive effect on health by supporting better excess to jobs and housing. The development of an SDA would also involve new services (possibly including a school and health facilities) and a relief road that would help to reduce congestion through the village centre (thus having positive effects on air quality and wellbeing). Scenario 2 would also support housing growth, which ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing through improved choice, and also provision of infrastructure enhancement such as open space. Whilst this would have beneficial effect to the community, development would be more piecemeal. Contributions would be sought to fund extensions to schools, but it may be less likely that this option creates the critical mass for new facilities (depending upon demand from surrounding SRVs as well). On balance, a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 is predicted to have a neutral effect as it does not lead to further growth beyond current commitments. This Scenario would also be less pressure on health and education facilities.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	The level of development on greenfield land associated with Scenarios 1 and 2 have the potential to lead to an increase in surface water run-off. The level of development for Scenario 3 is very low and unlikely to have any effects.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no areas at risk of fluvial flooding. Surface water flooding may present a risk throughout the settlement.					
Likelihood of effects	The majority of land surrounding Kibworth is not at risk of fluvial flooding and hence effects would be unlikely in this respect for each Scenario. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. There could be potential for enhancements through the use of SuDs, with particular opportunities at the SDA. Policy CS10 in the Adopted Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development does not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs. However, the intention is to '*minimise the net increase in surface water run-off discharged to sewers'*, which means that an increase might be anticipated in some areas.					
Significance	The level of development on greenfield land associated with Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 could potentially lead to an increase in surface water run-off rates. Although plan policies would seek to manage the impacts and incorporate SUDs there is potential for a cumulative negative effect on local flood risk from surface water. Conversely, development could present the opportunities to enhance flood management infrastructure, which has been recorded as an uncertain effect for Scenario 1. For Scenarios 2 and 3, the level of development would be lower and thus the effects are predicted to be neutral as areas of flood risk would be easier to avoid and cumulative effects on surface water would be reduced. **Recommendation**: Development ought to seek to ensure a net reduction or neutral effect on surface water run-off rates, rather than seeking to '*minimise the net increase' (which suggests that an increase is anticipated and accepted).* A review of Policy CS10 would be beneficial.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	×
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would deliver a significant amount of housing at a sustainable urban extension to Kibworth, helping to improve choice and support local provision of affordable and market homes. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the town centre, as well as creating new jobs in construction over the plan period. Scenario 1 would also involve new employment areas, which ought to be attractive to modern businesses. Scenario 2 would involve moderate growth on the edge of Kibworth. This would support new market and affordable homes in Kibworth. Scenario 3 would involve low levels of growth that would not support the growth of housing or economy in Kibworth.					
Sensitivity of receptors	A large amount of developable housing land has been identified through the draft SHLAA (2015). The wide range of shops, services, facilities and small businesses in Kibworth provide a range of employment opportunities in Kibworth. There are also more established employment areas on Harborough Road which provide further local employment.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1, the viability and deliverability of the SDA will need to be tested to ensure that it can be developed as envisaged. The development would be phased, but it is likely that a quantum of development could be delivered within 5 years, which would contribute to the District's 5 year supply. The SDA would also deliver land for employment use. Considering the deliverable sites in the SHLAA (2015), there is sufficient land available to support each of the Scenarios. Kibworth's role as a Rural Centre with good fairly good access to employment and services is likely to attract further growth in population.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would have a major positive effect on housing and economy by delivering over 1000 new homes and modern employment land as part of an SDA. The SDA would offer the opportunity to create a new community, with supporting local centre and good access to jobs and services. Although Scenario 2 would secure moderate levels of housing growth, the effects would be much less positive compared to Scenario 1, hence a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would not support growth in Kibworth, which could have negative effects on housing and employment provision in this settlement. Given Kibworth's role as a Rural Centre, a minor negative effect is predicted.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Growth in housing and employment would lead to increased travel to and from Kibworth which would be likely to result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Development would lead to an increase in resource use through housing and employment. However, this would occur irrespective of where development occurs. Having said this, an SDA may present better opportunities to deliver high quality sustainable design compared to smaller piecemeal developments.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Kibworth is fairly well served by facilities and jobs, but links to the main settlements of Market Harborough, Leicester and Lutterworth are most likely to be by private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Car travel is likely to remain the dominant form of travel under each scenario. Although highways improvements under Scenario 1 would help to relieve congestion, it would also be likely to perpetuate car travel.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would involve a mixed use SDA at Kibworth, which would facilitate access to jobs locally for residents in Kibworth. This should lead to a reduction in carbon emissions from travel. Whilst car use is likely to continue under this Scenario, less housing would be delivered in the Selected Rural Villages and Rural Centres under this Scenario, and hence the overall effect would be positive in terms of reducing carbon emissions. Overall, a moderate positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would lead to moderate growth which could lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions from travel. The effects are predicted to be neutral, as the level of housing growth would be in-line with rates of growth (between 2001 and 2011 Census). Scenario 3 would lead to lower levels of growth in Kibworth. However, depending upon the Option involved there would be more housing growth in either Harborough, Lutterworth (SDA) and Scraptoft / Thurnby / Bushby (SDA) which ought to reduce carbon emissions across the district. Therefore, a minor positive effect is predicted for Scenario 3.					

Summary of effects for Kibworth

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	××	×	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	×××	×	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓✓✓	✓	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓✓	✓	×
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✓✓	-	✓

Ullesthorpe

Scenarios tested for Ullesthorpe

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Ullesthorpe to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Ullesthorpe. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate growth (27-54 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Ullesthorpe. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in Ullesthorpe in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Ullesthorpe as public transport links are poor between these settlements, and links to Leicester are stronger.
2a	Low / no growth (0-17 dwellings) No SDA	3, 4, 5	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		7	*10 ha*	*4ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
2b	Low/no growth (0-7 dwellings) with SDA in Lutterworth	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Resources (SA Objectives 1 and 2)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land (scenario 1) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. Conversely, development might offer the opportunity to enhance biodiversity. There would be a very limited effect on natural resources with scenario 3 as very little or no growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity, particularly for the no growth options and those that would not trigger developer contributions due to their small scale. *Environmental quality* - There could be loss of land classified as Grade 3 or Grade 2 under scenario 1. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.				
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no European of national designated wildlife sites within close proximity to Ullesthorpe. There is a Local Wildlife site to the north of the Golf Course. Open land for development contains hedges, trees and ponds with value to wildlife, with Bats, Great Crested Newts and Badgers having been recorded in the area. Agricultural land surrounding Ullesthorpe is classified as Grade 3 and Grade 2 to the north of the village.				
Likelihood of effects	Effects on designated Local Wildlife Sites are considered unlikely, as development would be at least 400m away from Ullesthorpe Marsh. Depending upon the location of development, there is potential for disturbance or loss of features of local wildlife value such as trees, bushes and ponds. For scenario 2 effects on biodiversity would be unlikely, given the low scale of growth. For scenario 1, it is likely that mitigation measures could be secured and potential enhancement. On balance a neutral effect is predicted at this stage. Under scenario 1, it is likely that there would be a loss of grade 2 or 3 agricultural land depending upon the location of development.				
Significance	Scenario 1 could lead to some localised effects on wildlife, but it is expected that mitigation measures could be secured. However, there would be a loss of agricultural land of either grade 2 or 3, which constitutes a minor negative effect. Scenario 2 is unlikely to have a significant effect on natural resources as the level of growth is very small scale. Consequently, a neutral effect is predicted.				

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent (or not at all) for scenario 2.				
Sensitivity of receptors	The Southern part of the Ullesthorpe urban area is designated as a Conservation Area containing 5 Grade 2 listed buildings. Landscape surrounding Ullesthorpe varies in its sensitivity and capacity to change. Areas identified as potential development sites (in the SHLAA) are classified as having a mixture of medium to high capacity to change.				
Likelihood of effects	Effects on landscape character could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in to the edges of the settlement that could alter its character. For Scenario 1, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced compared to scenario 2, where development would be very low or nil. Effects on listed buildings are unlikely given that potential development sites are not adjacent nor contain listed buildings. Some potential development locations are adjacent to the Conservation Area, so there could be an effect on its setting, but careful design and layout ought to mitigate any effects.				
Significance	Scenario 2 is unlikely to have any effect on the built or natural heritage due to the low scale of growth. Scenario 1 has the potential to affect landscape character depending upon the location of development, but it is likely that mitigation measures could be secured or the most sensitive areas avoided; nevertheless, a minor negative effect is predicted at this stage. It is not anticipated that there would be any significant effects on heritage assets, but this would need to be explored further at project level.				

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)		Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✘
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would offer the potential to enhance community infrastructure through developer contributions. This could involve the improvement of open space, which would be positive for health and wellbeing. Under scenario 2a/2b, there would be little growth, which would limit opportunities to enhance community infrastructure. A lack of growth would limit opportunities for new housing for local residents, which would not help to address the need for affordable housing. Scenario 1 would lead to increased pressure on the primary school and health facilities, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenario 2b would see greater access to jobs and housing at an SDA in Lutterworth, which ought to have positive effects on residents in Ullesthorpe.				
Sensitivity of receptors	The primary school is at capacity, but it has potential to expand on site. Growth in Ullesthorpe would have implications for Broughton Astley GP. There is a shortfall of open space. Ullesthorpe has 5 of 6 key services identified in the Core Strategy. There is no train station in the settlement, but there is an hourly bus service throughout the day.				
Likelihood of effects	Under Scenario 2a/2b, it is likely that health and wellbeing will remain unchanged in the short to medium term. Over the longer term, there may be an increased demand for housing as the 0-15 age group become older. A lack of growth may mean that local people would probably move out of the area and the sense of community and identity may be lost over time. Scenario 2a/2b would not support growth in Ullesthorpe, which may lead to a lack of housing (including affordable). For Scenario 2b, the increased offer of housing and employment at Lutterworth SDA ought to offset the lack of housing in Ullesthorpe to an extent. For scenario 1, the maximum level of growth is not substantial, but it could help to support the viability of local facilities by increasing the local population (and hence spending). For scenario 2a/2b, there would be little or no growth in Ullesthorpe, which could have negative implications for local facilities. Negative effects on the primary school are unlikely, as there is capacity to expand on site, and development contributions would be sought to support improvements. The potential to enhance open space is likely to be greater for Scenario 1, which could trigger the requirement for development contributions. For scenario 2.				

Significance	Scenario 1 would lead to a moderate amount of growth, which could put pressure on local health and education services. However, it would provide opportunities to enhance community facilities such as open space and could also support the viability of local services such as shops and pubs. It would also support affordable housing provision in the settlement. Consequently a minor positive effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Under scenario 2a a minor negative effect is predicted as a lack of growth would be less likely to lead to improvements to community infrastructure, and would be less likely to achieve affordable housing provision. These effects would be 'offset' to an extent under Scenario 2b, which could improve the health and wellbeing for some residents who are able to access employment in Lutterworth SDA (or choose to move from Ullesthorpe to the SDA, which would provide greater housing choice in the area). Consequently a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 2b.

Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)	**Scenario 1**	-	**Scenario 2a**	-
			Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenario 1 which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 2 would involve a low or no level of development.			
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood zones 2 and 3 do not affect the main village or sites identified in the draft SHLAA (2015) for potential development.			
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.			
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for both scenarios.			

Housing and Economy (SA objectives 7 and 8)		Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✘
				Scenario 2a	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would deliver greater choice of housing, which would help to support the local population. Scenario 2a would be unlikely to provide the housing needed to support the local population and could therefore have negative effects on local housing provision. Scenario 2b would not provide local housing, but there would be significant provision at an SDA in nearby Lutterworth. Development in Ullesthorpe would be relatively well related to employment opportunities at Magna Park, but access would be most likely by private transport. Scenario 1 would support local facilities such as pubs and shops, which could have a small positive effect on the village economy. This would not be the case for scenario 2 as there would be little or no development.				
Sensitivity of receptors	The village is relatively well located in relation to Magna Park, Lutterworth and Hinckley all of which offer employment opportunities. There was a population increase of 8.5% between 2001 to 2011. Further growth is likely over the plan period, with a need for local housing. The community see it as essential that the village shop and post office remain open.				
Likelihood of effects	Sufficient deliverable land has been identified in the draft SHLAA (2015) to deliver the housing targets for Scenario 1. It is therefore likely that the housing targets could be delivered. For Scenario 2a and 2b, it is likely that some local residents would need to move out of Ullesthorpe; particularly in the long term when the 0-15 age group would be likely to form households and the growing population may require specialise accommodation for older people.				
Significance	Scenario 1 would have a minor positive effect on housing and the economy in Ullesthorpe by delivering new housing that would help to support the likely growth in population and household needs. The effects are only minor as the level of housing delivery would only be moderate. Scenario 2a would have a minor negative effect on housing in Ullesthorpe as it would be unlikely to match the anticipated housing needs (*Objectively assessed needs have not been determined, but it is expected that growth would occur given that there was an 8.5% increase in population between 2001-2011). This would also be likely to lead to residents leaving Ullesthorpe and would not help to support the long term viability of shops and services. Scenario 2b would offset these negative effects to an extent as there would be good access to employment and housing at an SDA in nearby Lutterworth, hence a minor positive effect is predicted.				

Resource Use (SA objective 9)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1 would be likely to lead to increased road trips with associated greenhouse gas emissions. Scenario 2a/2b would not lead to further growth in a rural area, which would help to ensure that car trips did not increase (to and from Ullesthorpe). New development will lead to an overall increase in energy and water use in Ullesthorpe. However, this would be the case wherever development was located and national standards would ensure that energy and water efficiency targets were delivered.				
Sensitivity of receptors	Ullesthorpe ward has carbon emissions of 2.1 Tonnes per person from domestic gas and electricity consumption (based on 2011 data). Around 10% of homes rely on electric heating and a further approximately 10% use oil. The contributions from oil are not included in the figures. In addition to emissions, there is a higher risk of householders falling into fuel poverty. Ullesthorpe also has a higher proportion of detached homes, which require more heating.				
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Husbands Bosworth and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are hourly bus services in the day and some local services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.				
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living Ullesthorpe; which as a rural centre, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that new development could therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district. Although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant as the scale of growth is very small. Scenario 2a/2b would not lead to significant further greenhouse gas emissions from Ullesthorpe, and growth would be delivered at SDAs or larger urban areas that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. Although this is positive, the scale of growth under the alternative scenarios (i.e. scenario 1) is not significant, and therefore the effects for Scenario 2 would also be neutral. **Recommendation:** Development in Ullesthorpe should be connected to the gas and electricity networks, and where possible seek to improve connectivity for those dwellings that are reliant upon oil and electric heating. New development also ought to be in smaller, non-detached homes that use less energy. This will help to reduce carbon emissions, and also help to increase the proportion of non-detatched dwellings in Ullesthorpe; which are likely to be needed and appropriate given the aging population, and high proportion of 1 or 2 person households.				

Summary of effects in Ullesthorpe

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Resources (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✘	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✘	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✘	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓	✘	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	-

Effects on Bitteswell

Scenarios tested for Bitteswell

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Bitteswell to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Bitteswell. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate-high growth (40-53 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Bitteswell. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in Bitteswell in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Bitteswell as public transport links are poor between these settlements, and links to Leicester are stronger.
2a	Low – moderate growth (17-34 dwellings) No SDA	3, 4, 5	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		7	*10 ha*	*4ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
2b	Low-moderate growth (12-27 dwellings) with SDA in Lutterworth	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land (scenario 1 and 2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. *Environmental quality* - There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no designated wildlife sites within close proximity to Bitteswell. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to willdife. Bitteswell Brook contains area of importance, as well as mature hedges around the settlement that are important habitat corridors. Agricultural land surrounding Bitteswell is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects on Bitteswell Brook would be unlikely, as available development sites (in the draft SHLAA, 2015) are not in close proximity. Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement. Nevertheless, disturbance and loss of habitats such as hedgerows would be likely.					
Significance	Although scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, there are no designated sites, and mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity for both Scenario 1 and 2, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under alternatives 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable. For alternative 1, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2a	×	Scenario 2b	×
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. This would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The Bitteswell urban area is designated as a Conservation Area, containing 13 listed buildings. The town is small scale with a unique character that could be affected by significant development.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced compared to Scenario 2.					
Significance	Depending upon where development is located, Scenario 1 has the potential for negative effects on Bitteswell particularly at 'gateways' to the settlement such as from the north. Housing is fairly low density, overlooking green space, and this would be permanently altered if substantial development occurs. In the context of Bitteswell, this constitutes a moderate negative effect. For Scenario 2, the effects would be similar in nature, but the potential to deliver lower density or smaller scale development would be increased, hence only a minor negative effect is predicted. **Recommendation –** Development in Bitteswell ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. Although new development would be likely to fall outside the Conservation Area, it is considered that the design principles within the CA should also apply to new development.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓?	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) would improve housing choice and affordability, which ought to have positive effects on health and wellbeing. There would be increased pressure on the primary school, and car trips would likely increase due to accessing employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2 would help to support the viability of a village shop as they would deliver more housing to the area.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The primary school is at capacity, but it has potential to expand on site. There are limited facilities in the village, and public transport links are not used by the majority of the population as over 80% of trips are by car and 12% work from home (Census 2011). There are community aspirations for improved facilities, and potentially a community shop / post office (*Bitteswell with Bittesby Settlement Profile).*					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of a new village shop, it is unclear whether this would occur, or if the scale of growth would be adequate. Negative effects on the primary school are unlikely, as there is capacity to expand on site, and development contributions would be sought to support improvements.					
Significance	Scenario 1 could increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these Scenarios also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing, which is a minor positive effect for Scenario 1. Scenario 1 could also help to support the viability of a new community shop (although only slightly) and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the likelihood of this is unclear; hence an uncertain effect is predicted. Scenario 2a would have similar effects to Scenario 1, but at a smaller scale, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. Scenario 2b would provide alternative accommodation and improved access to jobs at the SDA in nearby Lutterworth, which ought to have a minor positive effect on health and wellbeing.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and 2, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 3 would not involve any development, so effects would be neutral.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood zones 2 and 3 are identified around Bitteswell Brook but they do not affect the main village or sites identified in the SHLAA.					
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all 3 scenarios.					

Housing and Economy (S`A objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a and 2b) would support the delivery of market and affordable housing in Bitteswell, which would have a positive effect on housing. This could also contribute to a modest increase in local spending, which would support the viability of the Village. Alternative housing and employment would be provided in nearby Lutterworth under Scenario 2b.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Between 2001-2011 there was a 21% increase in the population and an 8% increase in dwellings. There is good access to local employment opportunities at Magna Park and Lutterworth, although this would be likely to be by private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Sufficient deliverable land has been identified in the SHLAA (2015) to deliver the housing targets for Scenario 1 and 2a/2b. It is therefore likely that the housing targets would be delivered under each scenario.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would have a moderate positive effect on housing and the economy in Bitteswell by delivering new housing that would help to support the growth in population and households. Scenario 2a would promote more modest growth, so the effects are only considered to be minor. Scenario 2b would have more benefits than Scenario 2b due to improved housing choice and employment opportunities at Lutterworth SDA, hence a moderate positive effect is predicted.					

Resource Use (SA objective 9)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-2 would be likely to lead to increased road trips with associated greenhouse gas emissions. New development will lead to an overall increase in energy and water use in Bitteswell. However, this would be the case wherever development was located and national standards would ensure that energy and water efficiency targets were delivered.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Data about carbon emissions and energy use has not been established for Bitteswell. However, it is likely that as a rural area, some properties will be reliant on oil as a source of heating, which contributes greater greenhouse gas than grid connected properties. As this is a small settlement, access to services, jobs and public transport is limited, and hence there are high levels of car usage. However, there are local job opportunities at Magna Park and Lutterworth that mean some journeys are not long distance.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Husbands Bosworth and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 and 2 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Bitteswell; which as a sustainable rural village, only has limited access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under these Scenarios would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district. Although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant as the overall scale of growth is very small. Consequently a neutral effect is predicted on resource use for Scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 2b could have positive implications in that it would provide enhanced access to jobs in Lutterworth. Although car travel would be likely to be the dominant mode of travel, this ought to reduce trip length, which is positive in terms of reducing carbon emissions. Consequently, a minor positive effect is predicted for Scenario 2b.					

Summary of effects on Bitteswell

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Resources (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✘	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✘✘	✘	✘
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓?	-	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (S`A objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA objective 9)	-	-	✓

Church Langton

Scenarios tested for Church Langton

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Church Langton to assess the implications of the 11 strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Church Langton. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Low-moderate growth (17-26 dwellings)	1, 2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	In terms of housing growth, two scenarios have been identified for -Church Langton; low growth and low-moderate growth. Although the actual numbers of dwellings proposed are not significantly different between these scenarios, in terms of the rate of growth, there are noticeable differences. Scenario 2 has been sub-divided into 2a and 2b because an SDA in Kibworth (which is within 3.5 miles of Church Langton) would provide job opportunities as well as alternative housing.
2a	Low growth (8-13 dwellings) without an SDA at Kibworth	6	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		3		*4 ha*			*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*			*23ha*	
2b	Low growth (6-16 dwellings) with an SDA at Kibworth	5, 7,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3ha*	*22 ha*	
		9	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28ha*	

SA Findings for Church Langton

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. The scale of development however would limit the effects. *Environmental quality* There could be a loss of land classified as Grade 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.				
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no sensitive wildlife receptors in Church Langton except two Tree Protection Orders, one along Stonton Road and lane to Glebe Farm and one along the northern edge of Churchyard. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Church Langton is classified as Grade 3.				
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of development. This could also include the potential for enhancement. The levels of growth proposed are unlikely to lead to significant effects if appropriate sites are selected and mitigation secured.				
Significance	Although Scenario 1 presents the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures ought to limit the effects on local wildlife, especially at the level of growth proposed. As a result Scenario 1 is predicted to have neutral effects. Scenario 2 would have similar effects but at a lesser scale still. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable. However, the magnitude of the effects would be minor, and hence a neutral effect is predicted.				

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and less so for Scenario 2.				
Sensitivity of receptors	Church Langton is in a Conservation Area and contains 5 Grade II listed buildings and 2 Grade II* listed buildings, Church of St Peter and the Old Rectory. The setting of East Langton Conservation Area will also need to be considered. As will the registered park and garden at Langton Hall. The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development.				
Likelihood of effects	Scenario 2 would lead to small scale development which could probably be accommodated on one strategic site and smaller windfall development. The only site identified in the SHLAA at the time of appraisal is not adjacent to any heritage assets, but is on public open space and its development would affect the character of the settlement if this site was developed. Scenario 1 may also involve this site but would require further land to be identified too. If appropriately designed, negative effects could probably be avoided.				
Significance	The scale of growth under Scenario 1 is low-moderate, and although the character of the settlement is sensitive to development, it is likely that mitigation could be secured to avoid significant effects. Scenario 2 would lead to a lesser level of growth, and thus would also have a neutral effect. **Recommendation –** Development in Church Langton ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA), registered park and garden and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.				

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✗
			Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would support a greater range of housing, allowing existing residents to move to new homes in the local area. This ought to help to maintain community identity. Scenario 2a involves lower levels of growth, which would limit opportunities for local residents to access housing. This could lead to a loss of community identify over time as residents look for alternative accommodation outside the village. For Scenario 2b, there would be no growth in housing in Church Langton, but the development of an SDA at Kibworth under Scenario 2b would present alternative housing and employment that could be accessed by residents in Church Langton. Scenario 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2a/2b would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. The scale of development proposed in Church Langton is relatively low, so the magnitude of effects is not great.			
Sensitivity of receptors	The proportion of people aged 35-54 is higher (33%) than the District average (30%). The proportion aged 0 -15 is just below average. The primary school in Church Langton is close to capacity and it is noted that the site would probably need to be extended. This would likely come from S106 contributions. There are a number of different facilities in the village. Public transport links are not frequently used, with 73% of people using a car or van to get to work (Census 2011).			
Likelihood of effects	Under Scenario 1 and certainly under Scenario 2a, it is likely that health and wellbeing will remain unchanged in the short to medium term. Over the longer term, there may be an increased demand for housing as the youthful population become older. It cannot be guaranteed that new housing will be accessible, affordable or desirable to local communities. Therefore, the provision of a greater choice of housing may not necessarily benefit residents in Church Langton. For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2a/2b, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. For Scenario 2b, the development of employment provision at an SDA in Kibworth ought to have a positive effect in terms of improving access to employment for residents in Church Langton.			
Significance	Each scenario is likely to lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these options also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. The scale of growth is also minor, so effects are not considered to be significant. Scenario 1 ought to improve housing choice and affordability in Church Langton, which could have a positive effect on the health and wellbeing of local communities and help to retain community identity. However, there is no certainty that new housing would be accessed by local residents. On balance a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 does not support much new development in Church Langton which may affect the availability of housing. In the short term, this might be beneficial in terms of preserving the character and community identity of Church Langton. However, there could be a decline in the villages housing offer in the longer term, which may lead to young people having to move away, which could affect community spirit and diversity. For each scenario there would be a need to increase provision of health and school facilities, but it is expected that this could be provided through developer contributions. Scenario 2b is predicted to have a minor positive effect on health, as it would lead to enhanced access to employment opportunities at Kibworth.			

Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2, which would likely require the development of greenfield land. There are no in or around flood zones around Church Langton.				
Sensitivity of receptors	There are natural ponds in Church Langton, but these are not considered flood risks at this stage.				
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.				
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted.				

Housing and Economy (SA objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✘
			Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a and 2b would help to improve housing choice and affordability in Church Langton, with knock on beneficial effects on the village economy, through increased spending on local services. Scenario 2b would also allow for residents to benefit from increased housing choice and job opportunities at an SDA in Kibworth. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help supplement the current 13% of residents who work from home.			
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been an increase of 11.7% dwellings since 2001 in Church Langton. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 2% of economically active people in Church Langton who are unemployed (Census 2011).			
Likelihood of effects	There is only capacity for 12 dwellings on one site identified in the SHLAA 2014. Therefore, for Scenario 1, there is uncertainty about whether further development sites will be identified to support a higher level of growth. The housing provision in Church Langton under Scenarios 2a and 2b would be easier to achieve, although may require some smaller windfall developments. Employment provision at Kibworth is likely to benefit some local residents given its close proximity. However, the need for jobs is not a major issue in Church Langton.			
Significance	Scenario 1 is predicted to have a minor positive effect on delivering housing targets (including the provision of affordable housing). Scenarios 2a and 2b will provide a small amount or no growth, and potentially would have a negative effect in terms of not providing affordable, sustainable and good quality housing for local residents. This effect is offset somewhat for Scenario 2b as an SDA at nearby Kibworth could provide alternative housing. None of the scenarios are likely to have a significant effect on the village economy, although Scenario 1 ought to be more positive than Scenario 2 given the slightly higher level of growth (And hence potential for local spending). Job opportunities for residents would not be affected under Scenarios 1 and 2a, but for Scenario 2b, there would be substantial new employment provision in Kibworth, which could have beneficial effects for younger members of the community when the land is developed. A minor positive effect is therefore predicted for Scenario 2b.			

Resource Use (SA objective 9)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2a would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs, so neutral effects are predicted. In terms of travel, car journeys would be likely to increase, which would lead to a minor increase in greenhouse gas emission given that residents need to travel to access jobs and higher order services. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2a and 2b, although the difference is negligible. For Scenario 2b, there is potential for shorter journeys to places of employment, as there would be job creation in Kibworth.				
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in the rural areas such as Church Langton. As such there is a reliance on private transport.				
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Church Langton and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable day time bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.				
Significance	Scenarios 1 (and to a lesser extent 2a and 2b) would lead to increased numbers of people living in Church Langton; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely new housing would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions through increased car trips. However, a neutral effect is predicted, as the magnitude of effects is very small. For Scenario 2b, housing would be delivered at Kibworth SDA, which is a more sustainable alternative to higher housing growth in Church Langton. This is more positive than Scenarios 1 and 2a, but as before, the effects are small in scale, and hence not significant.				

Summary of effects for Church Langton

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	-	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	-	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✗	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓	✗	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	-

Claybrooke Magna

Scenarios tested for Claybrooke Magna

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Claybrooke Magna to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Claybrooke Magna. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Very high growth (68 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Claybrooke Magna (by car). Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Clearly, a higher provision ought to be more beneficial for residents in terms of access to jobs. However, given that the difference is not significant, and there are ample opportunities at nearby Magna Park, it is not likely that the effects on Medbourne in terms of access to employment opportunities would be significantly different between options that propose 4 ha and those that propose 10 ha (in Lutterworth). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Medbourne given that it is over 25km away and public transport access between the settlements is poor.
2	High growth (45-53 dwellings)	2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5		*4 ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
3	Moderate growth (19-37 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		6, 8		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28 ha*	
		7		*4ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1, 2 and 3) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term depending upon when development occurs. *Environmental quality* There could be a loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1 and 2 and to a lesser extent 3. Increased development could lead to increased emissions to the air and a need to treat increased amounts of wastewater.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no designated national or local wildlife sites or TPOs in the area, but open land for development may contain habitats of local value to wildlife such as trees, hedges and grassland. Agricultural land surrounding Claybrooke Magna is classified as Grade 3. There are no prominent air quality or water quality issues.					
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement. There is unlikely to be any significant biodiversity effects due to there being no sensitive sites in Claybrooke Magna, nor large scale development.					
Significance	Although Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures ought to limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2 and 3, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1, 2 and 3, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✗✗	Scenario 2	✗	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Claybrooke Magna has particular significance being a focal point due to its location at the crossing point of two principle Roman roads (Watling Street and Fosse Road). Its character would need to be respected by any new development, although Claybrooke Magna does not have a Conservation Area. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Scenario 3 has the potential to affect the character to a certain extent.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Claybrooke Magna contains 7 listed buildings and a Scheduled Monument (Roman town, High Cross). The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development. A priority for the parish council is to maintain separation between Claybrooke Magna and Claybrooke Parva.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. Sensitivity of listed buildings and the Scheduled Monument would need to be respected. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2 and 3, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land.					
Significance	Housing is fairly low density in Claybrooke Magna, with 57% of homes detached, overlooking green space. This would be likely to be permanently altered if substantial development occurred in this location. This constitutes a moderate negative effect for Scenario 1 which proposes high levels of growth. For Scenario 2, the effects would be similar in nature, but the potential to deliver lower density or smaller scale development would be increased, hence only a minor negative effect is predicted. The effects would be lesser still for Scenario 3 and 4 and hence a neutral effect is predicted. **Recommendation –** Development in Claybrooke Magna ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	?	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenarios 2 and 3), would support a greater choice and affordability of housing. Lower growth would limit housing choice for local residents, which could lead to a loss of community identify over time as residents look for alternative accommodation. Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (to a lesser extent) would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2 would be more likely to help to support the viability of a village shop as they would deliver more housing to the area.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The village has a greater proportion of the population aged 35-64 than is seen in Harborough District as a whole. The population profile is relatively young compared with some villages. The proportion of the population aged 65 and over is well below the District level. The primary school capacity is unknown, the capacity of Broughton Astley GP surgery is severely constrained and contributions towards a new GP surgery facility would be sought. GPs in Broughton Astley are also at capacity and would be affected by significant development. There are limited facilities in the village. Public transport links are not frequently used by the majority of the population as over 80% of trips are by car (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities, it is unlikely that the scale of growth would be adequate to have a significant effect. Negative effects on the primary school are likely as is the strain on the GPs in Broughton Astley which are already over capacity. Development contributions would be sought to support improvements though. It is unclear whether school capacity could be expanded on site or would need to be provided in higher order settlements such as Broughton Astley.					
Significance	Scenario 1 will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these options also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. These options could support the viability village amenities and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the likelihood of this is unclear. The strain it would put on existing services including the SLCTI would almost certainly lead to a negative effect without these contributions and new facilities. As a result, an uncertain negative effect is predicted. These effects are less pronounced with Scenario 2, although a similar trend is likely. An uncertain effect is predicted here. Scenario 3 would provide a small amount of growth which is less likely to have negative impacts on services, and hence a neutral effect is predicted.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3, which would more than likely require the development of greenfield land. Areas to the west of the village are identified as Flood Zone 2 and 3.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood zones 2 and 3 are identified to the west but they do not affect the main village.						
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.						
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted.						

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓?	Scenario 2	✓?	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 would add comprehensive development to the area, which would have a positive effect on housing by increase choice and affordability. Supporting the local population would also help to maintain the viability an vitality of the village centre. This is also the case to a lesser extent in Scenario 2 and 3. In line with policy, affordable housing will be provided proportionally. As a result, the greater development in Scenario 1 and 2 will provide the opportunity for more affordable housing in Claybrooke Magna. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as an upgrade in Claybrooke Magna is due in late 2014/early2015, which would help supplement and add to residents who work from home (currently 7%). More people are likely to lead to more economic activity in Lutterworth with Claybrooke Magna only a short distance away.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There have been no new dwellings since 2001 in Claybrooke Magna. There is a need for affordable housing and a high number of detached homes. There are only 2% of economically active people in Claybrooke Magna who are unemployed (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	Housing supply / capacity in Claybrooke Magna was unknown at the time of appraisal, so there is a degree of uncertainty whether sufficient deliverable land is available to meet the housing targets in each of the scenarios. Increased housing would improve the offer available in Claybrooke Magna. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, than Scenario 2 and 3. Current infrastructure however may be stretched with this higher growth option, and contributions to improve infrastructure would be required. Whilst there are relatively few employers in Claybrooke Magna itself, the village benefits from its close proximity to Lutterworth and Magna Park and a wider range of employment opportunities. An increased housing offer would provide the opportunity for people to move and commute. A range of homes could also provide opportunities for young people to stay in the village. It is unclear whether available land exists to deliver higher rates of growth, therefore there is some uncertainty about whether Scenarios 1 and 2 in particular could be achieved.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1 or 2, ought to have a positive effect housing in Claybrooke Magna, as well as supporting local spending. A positive effect is predicted but there is some uncertainty about whether this level of development is deliverable. Scenario 3 will provide a more modest amount of growth, and would therefore be less likely to have significant positive effects.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There will also be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2 and 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is an hourly bus service in Claybrooke Magna although it does not run in evening or Sundays. As such there is a reliance on private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Claybrooke Magna and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there is a reasonable day time bus service, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Claybrooke Magna; which only has moderate access to jobs and services. Together with a reliance on private transport and little organic growth in the last ten years, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor in relative sense). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would lead to more modest growth, although this is still more than recent trends in the area. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be quite as significant in Scenario 1. Nevertheless, a minor negative impact is still predicted.					

Summary of effects for Claybrooke Magna

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	x	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	xx	x	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	?	?	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓?	✓ ?	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	x	x	-

Dunton Bassett

Scenarios tested for Dunton Bassett

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Dunton Bassett to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Dunton Bassett. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

This part of appraisal does not consider effects 'outside' of Dunton Bassett; rather it provides a local view of what the implications might be for this specific settlement under various housing and employment options. Whilst this is useful to engage residents with the issues facing their local communities, it should also be borne in mind that the Local Plan (and SA) need to explore the implications at a strategic level. This means looking at how the options affect the district 'as a whole' and looking at cumulative and synergistic effecgs between settlements. These strategic effects are addressed in the next section of the SA Report that brings together the individual settlement level appraisals and explores the effects of the housing and employment options 'as a whole'.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (86-94 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Dunton Bassett. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in Dunton Bassett in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 3a and 3b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Dunton Bassett as public transport links are poor between these settlements, and links to Leicester are stronger.
2	Moderate-high growth (61-72 dwellings)	2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
3a	Moderate growth (33-46 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		7			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
3b	Moderate growth (24-50 dwellings) with SDA in Lutterworth	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Dunton Bassett

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3a	-
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenarios 1, 2 and 3) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. . *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. There are 5 wildlife sites and 3 TPOs in Dunton Bassett. Agricultural land surrounding Dunton Bassett is classified as Grade 3. There is also an area of grade 2 agricultural land adjacent to the southern part of the village.					
Likelihood of effects	Development has potential to affect wildlife through the loss of greenspace and habitats such as trees and hedgrerows. However, mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of developments on affected sites.					
Significance	Although Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2 and 3, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1, 2 and 3, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Scenario 3 has the potential to affect the character to a certain extent.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Dunton Bassett contains 14 listed buildings including a Grade II* (Church of All Saints) and a Scheduled Monument (Moated site with fishpond). The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development. There is no Conservation Area designation at present but such a designation is a stated aim of the parish plan.						
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2 and 3, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land.						
Significance	Housing is fairly low density in Dunton Bassett, overlooking green space, and this could be permanently altered if substantial development occurred in with Scenario 1 and 2. The SHLAA sites proposed for development do limit this to some extent, but there would still be a loss particularly to existing housing close to these areas. This constitutes a moderate negative effect. For Scenario 2, the effects would be similar in nature, but the potential to deliver lower density or smaller scale development would be increased, hence only a minor negative effect is predicted. For Scenario 3, the effects are predicted to be neutral, as the level of growth would be fairly low and sensitive areas could be more easily avoided. **Recommendation –** Development in Dunton Bassett ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement.						

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
					Scenario 3b	✓
Nature of effects	In Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, there is likely to be a strain on existing resources, particularly with the capacity of Broughton Astley GP practice. It is likely a new GP would be required in Broughton Asltley for which contributions would be required. With lower levels of growth, in Scenario 3a and 3b, opportunities for housing could be limited, potentially leading to a loss of community identify over time as residents look for alternative accommodation. Scenarios 1, 2 and 3a/2b (to a lesser extent) would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2 would be more likely to help to support the viability of village services they would deliver more housing to the area although the likelihood of this is uncertain. Scenario 3b should lead to increased job opportunities due to the SDA in Lutterworth, which should have positive effects on health.						
Sensitivity of receptors	The population has declined in Dunton Bassett over the last 10 years by 4.5%. 17.9% of population is in 0-15 age group whilst 16.9% of population is 65 or over. The village has a greater proportion of the population aged 35-64 (33%) than is seen in Harborough District as a whole. The primary school in Dunton Bassett is at capacity and it is noted in the Settlement Profile that the site is constrained with limited space to extend. GPs are at capacity and would be affected by significant development. There are limited facilities in the village, although do currently cater adequately for the current population. Public transport links are not frequently used by the majority of the population as 86% of trips are by car (Census 2011).						
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities, it is unclear whether the scale of growth would have a significant effect in this respect. Negative effects on the primary school are likely as is the strain on the GP. Development contributions would be sought to support improvements, but it would be difficult to provide new facilities locally.						
Significance	Scenario 1 could increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. This scenario supports residents to remain in the area by improving housing choice and affordability, could support the viability of new amenities and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. It would be likely that new health and education facilities would need to be provided outside the settlement, which limits the positive effects. On balance a minor positive effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would have similar effects to Scenario 1. Although the positive effects would be less pronounced , there would also be slightly less pressure on local services. Therefore, a neutral effect is predicted overall. Scenario 3a would provide a lower amount of growth would be less likely to put pressure on services, but there would be less opportunities to enhance facilities through contributions. There would also be lower amounts of housing provided. On balance a neutral effect is predicted. Whilst Scenario 3b would have the same effects, it ought to be slightly more beneficial than 3a given that the SDA would create employment opportunities that could benefit						

	local residents. Therefore a minor positive effect is predicted.

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3, which would require the development of greenfield land.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no flood zones in Dunton Bassett that affect the main village or sites identified in the draft SHLAA 2015. Surface water flooding could be an issue throughout the village.						
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.						
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all 3 scenarios.						

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)		Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-3b would support housing growth, helping to support local provision of affordable and market homes to meet needs. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the village. For alternatives that involve an SDA, access to employment opportunities and housing would also be likely to improve, although this would not be within Dunton Bassett itself. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband is coming to the area.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been an increase of 2% dwellings since 2001 in Dunton Bassett. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. The population is under represented in the 16-34 age groups compared to the wider District. The village has a relatively high proportion of detached properties which tend to be less affordable, higher development could increase the range of homes available in Dunton Bassett. There are only 2% of economically active people in Dunton Bassett who are unemployed (Census 2011). This shows a strong local economy, without the need for economic development.						
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer and choice available, as currently over 50% of houses in Dunton Bassett are detached. Whilst there are relatively few employers in Dunton Bassett itself, an increased housing offer would provide the opportunity for people to move and commute as is the current trend.						
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1 or 2, could have a positive effect on delivering housing targets (including the provision of affordable housing). Scenario 3 will provide a lower amount of growth, and would be unlikely to need the infrastructure of the other options, particularly Scenario 1. In terms of the economy and employment, no Scenario is likely to have a significant effect, although Scenario 3b would help to increase job opportunities at the SDA.						

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3a/3b would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There would be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which could increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2 and 3. Given that school places may have to be provided outside the village, this may also lead to greater number of car trips.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is poor in Dunton Basset with a limited Monday-Friday service. As such there is a reliance on private transport.						
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Dunton Bassett and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable day time bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.						
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Dunton Bassett; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport and the likelihood of new school places being provided outside the village, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 and 2. Scenarios 3a and 3b would lead to more modest growth and although there would still be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be as significant (i.e. they would be neutral).						

Summary of effects for Dunton Bassett

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3a	Scenario 3b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗	✗	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗✗	✗	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	-	-	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	-	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✗	✗	-	-

1.1 Foxton

Scenarios tested for Foxton

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Foxton to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Foxton. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (33-51 dwellings)	1, 2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Although there is no employment provision in Foxton, it is possible that an SDA in Kibworth would provide job opportunities that could be accessed by residents in Foxton. Scenarios 2a and 2b (and likewise 3a and 3b) involve the same scale of housing growth, but are differentiated in that scenarios 2a and 3b would involve an SDA at Kibworth and Scenarios 2b and 3a wouldn't. Two housing options fall within Scenario 3a, and these propose different levels of employment in Lutterworth and Fleckney. It is unlikely that these variations in employment would affect Foxton differently, as the scale of growth in Fleckney is not significant, and Lutterworth is less well related to Foxton than Market Harborough, for which employment growth is anticipated for all housing options.
2a	Moderate-high growth (23/31 dwellings) SDA	5, 7	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3ha*	*22 ha*	
2b	Moderate-high growth (25 dwellings)	6	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3ha*	*23 ha*	
3a	Low/no growth (15/16 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*	-		*23ha*	
3b	Low/no growth (12 dwellings) with SDA	9	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	*5 ha*	*3ha*	*28ha*	

SA findings for Foxton

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)		Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 3a	-
				Scenario 2b	-	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For natural environment, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1-2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. There would be a limited effect on natural resources with Scenario 3 as no or very little growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There is one Local Wildlife Site, the Grand Union Canal Harborough Arm and a number of TPOs in Foxton. Development may contain habitats of local value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Foxton is classified as Grade 3.						
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers and ponds could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement.						
Significance	Although Scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance, and there are sensitive wildlife habitats nearby. For Scenario 2, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenarios 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil. There would be no effect on natural resources under Scenario 3.						

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2a	×	Scenario 3a	-
				Scenario 2b	×	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For built and natural heritage, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Foxton is located within the Laughton Hills Landscape Character Area which has low - medium landscape capacity to accommodate development; it is one of the most sensitive landscapes in the District.						
Sensitivity of receptors	The village sits in the Foxton Conservation Area which covers practically the entire extent of the built up part of the village and also the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area which cuts through the village. Foxton contains 16 listed buildings including two Grade II* Listed Church of St Andrew and Foxton Locks, Grand Union Canal. There is also a Scheduled Monument, an inclined plane immediately east of Foxton Locks. The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development.						
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced. Given the flood constraints to the North, it is likely that development would need to be to the south of the Settlement, which would present the potential for negative effects on the Grand Union Canal.						
Significance	Housing is low density in Foxton and if substantial development occurred it could alter the character in this location. If development was located to the south (which is possible given flood risk to the north) there would be potential effects on the Grand Union Canal. Consequently, a moderate negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 and a minor negative effect for Scenario 2a and 2b. Scenario 3 would have a limited effect given the low scale of growth, thus a neutral effect is predicted. **Recommendation –** Development in Foxton ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA), Scheduled Monuments and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.						

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 3a	✗
			Scenario 2b	-	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a/2b, housing provision would help to improve housing choice and affordability, which ought to have positive effects on residents in the village that wish to form a household or move to larger/specialised accommodation (for example young families). With low growth, as per Scenario 3a/3b, these effects would not occur, and this could lead to an erosion of community identify over time as local residents might need to look for alternative accommodation outside the village. Scenarios 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2a/2b would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2a/2b would be more likely to help to support the vitality of village shops and services as they would deliver more housing to the area. However, these effects are small scale. Scenario 2a and 3b, which would involve an SDA in Kibworth, would provide enhanced employment opportunities for local residents in Foxton, which ought to have positive effects on health and wellbeing.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The population in Foxton has noticeable differences from the District trends. There are considerably larger proportion of the population being aged 55 – 74 and a below average representation of those in the 16-34 age groups. The primary school in Foxton has limited capacity and an extension may be required. However, the site is constrained with limited space for an extension. Development would also be expected to contribute to improved GP service capacity in Market Harborough. Public transport links are not frequently used, 71% of people use a car or van to get to work. Just over 13% work from home (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	There is likely to be a need for special needs housing for an aging population as part of the development. Scenario 1 would best provide for this by planning for a higher level of growth (Which could include specialist housing). For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of a new village amenities, it is unclear whether this would occur, or if the scale of growth would be adequate. It is possible that the additional demand for education would have to be provided outside of Foxton given that the site is constrained.					
Significance	Scenarios 1 (and to a lesser extent scenarios 2a/2b) will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these options also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. These options could support enhancements to open space through developer contributions. A minor positive effect is predicted for Scenario 1. A neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 2b, due to the lower scale of growth. However under Scenario 2a there would be a development of an SDA in nearby Kibworth which could offset these effects to an extent and also improve access to employment opportunities. Therefore, a minor positive effect is predicted for 2b. Scenario 3a and 3b do not support new development in Foxton which may affect the availability of housing locally. Although community identity would be preserved in the short term, there could be a decline in the villages housing offer in the longer term affecting community spirit and diversity. On balance a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 3a. For Scenario 3b, these effects would still occur, but the development of an SDA in Kibworth would offset the negative effects to an extent, so on balance a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 3b.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 3a	-
			Scenario 2b	-	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For resilience to climate change, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent 2, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 3 would not involve any development, so effects would be neutral. Flood Zones 2 and 3 are identified around the northern edge of settlement and the Grand Union Canal Harborough Arm.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the north of Foxton.					
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be sited where it is at risk of river flooding, which would limit growth to the north of the settlement. However, with higher levels of growth, the potential for sites to intersect with areas of flood risk would increase. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be a major issue for any of the development Scenarios. However, for Scenario 1 involving higher levels of growth it may be more difficult to avoid areas of flood risk. Therefore an uncertain effect is predicted for Scenario 1.					

Housing and Economy (SA objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 3a	✗
			Scenario 2b	-	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would lead to housing provision in Foxton, which would contribute to meeting housing needs and improving choice. Scenario 3a would not affect the levels of house building in Foxton, which could have negative effects in terms of not meeting local need. Whilst Scenario 3b would also lead to low levels of growth in Foxton, there would be alternative housing at an SDA in Kibworth, which would offset this effect to an extent. It would also provide better access to employment opportunities. New homes could also help support the rural economy with more people spending money at village shops, although this is not likely to have a significant effect. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help support residents to work from home.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been no dwellings increase since 2001 in Foxton. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 2% of economically active people in Foxton who are unemployed (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Foxton. Scenarios 2a and 3b which include an SDA at Kibworth would provide alternative housing and employment opportunities, which could benefit residents from Foxton.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1, would have a positive effect on delivering housing (including the provision of affordable housing) in Foxton. Scenario 2b would provide a moderate amount of growth, and so effects are predicted to be neutral. Scenario 3b would lead to low/no growth and as a result would have a negative effect in terms of not providing affordable, sustainable and good quality housing. Scenarios 3b and 2a would involve an SDA at Kibworth, which would provide alternative housing choice (albeit not in Foxton itself) and would also provide employment opportunities. Consequently, the overall effect of Scenario 3b is predicted to be neutral and the effect for Scenario 2a is a minor positive. In terms of the economy and employment, no Scenario is likely to have a significant effect, although Scenario 1 may help to support increased local spending in the village.					

Resource Use (SA objective 9)		Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 3a	✓
				Scenario 2b	-	Scenario 3b	✓
Nature of effects	**For resource use, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There would be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2. Scenario 3 would lead to lower housing in Foxton, and thus fewer emissions and resource use.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in the rural areas such as Foxton. As such there is a reliance on private transport.						
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon decentralised power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Foxton and any new development would be unlikely to change this. The majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.						
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Foxton; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2a/2b would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Foxton. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral). Scenario 3a/3b would limit further greenhouse gas emissions and growth would be delivered at SDAs or urban areas that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. This ought to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted for these scenarios.						

Summary of effects for Foxton

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b	Scenario 3a	Scenario 3b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	××	×	×	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	-	×	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	-	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓	✓	-	×	-
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	×	-	-	✓	✓

Gilmorton

Scenarios tested for Gilmorton

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Gilmorton to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Gilmorton. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (81-91 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Gilmorton. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in Gilmorton in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2 and 3 have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Gilmorton as public transport links are poor between these settlements, and links to Leicester are stronger.
2	Moderate growth (61-72 dwellings)	2, 3, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7		*4 ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
3	Moderate growth (24-50 dwellings) SDA Lutterworth	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Gilmorton

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats such grassland, hedges and trees. The magnitude of effects would not be high. *Environmental quality* - There is the potential for loss of land classified as Grade 2/3 under Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent scenarios 2 and 3. The total loss of land would be lower than 5 hectares even for the highest targets. Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. The level of growth is not substantial enough to have a significant effect though.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no designated sites within close proximity to Gilmorton. Gilmorton falls into one of the outer isochrones for the SSSI risk impact zones for Misterton Marshes. However, applications for residential development are not considered likely to have any impact. A belt of Grade 2 agricultural land runs through Gilmorton from the north east to the west of the village.						
Likelihood of effects	It is likely that effects on biodiversity could be avoided through sensitive layout and design. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land of Grade 2/3 under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent Scenarios 2 and 3. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car are likely to increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges.						
Significance	For Scenario 1, a minor negative effect is predicted as there could be a loss of agricultural land categorised as Grade 2/3. There is also the potential for effects on habitats of local importance such as hedges and trees. The effects are only considered to be minor as the surrounding areas are not particularly sensitive (and mitigation / enhancement ought to be possible), and the level of growth is not substantial. The effects of Scenario 2 and 3 would be similar to scenario 1, but at a lower scale, and hence a neutral effect is predicted for both.						

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most notable for scenario 1, which involves a higher level of development.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Gilmorton does not contain a Conservation Area, but there are 20 listed buildings, and 2 known sites of archaeological importance. Located within the Lutterworth Lowlands Landscape Character Area which has medium – high landscape capacity to accommodate development (in general terms it is an area that is able to accommodate development or change with only minor compromise or degradation of the existing landscape).						
Likelihood of effects	Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an effect on the character of the settlement. However, the small scale of growth ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated.						
Significance	Scenario 1 could lead to negative effects upon built and natural heritage through development on the edge of the settlement. The effects are considered to be minor, as the level of growth is not significant compared to the scale of the settlement and the historic rate of population growth between 2001-2011 (14%). It should also be possible to avoid any sensitive areas and mitigate potential impacts as in broad terms the landscape has capacity to accommodate change. Scenario 2 would involve a small level of growth and is not considered likely to have a significant effect on built or natural heritage. Scenario 3 would not involve any growth and thus a neutral effect is predicted.						

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-3 would require increased provision of local school and health provision, but this would be difficult to provide locally at higher levels of growth. Scenarios 1-3 would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions. The effects would be most positive for Scenario 1 and least so for Scenario 3. Scenario 1, would deliver a high rate of housing growth in Gilmorton, which ought to address affordability issues. Scenarios 2 and 3 would also make a contribution to affordable housing in Gilmorton itself, whilst for some options within these scenarios, there would also be provision of housing at Lutterworth SDA, which might help to offset the lack of provision in Gilmorton. Under scenario 4, there would be no growth at all, which would not support the delivery of market or affordable housing. This would have a negative effect on local communities that wish to live/remain in Gilmorton This scenario would not put pressure on local health and educational facilities, but it wouldn't provide opportunities for the enhancement of open space and community infrastructure as there would be no developer contributions secured.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 976 (decrease of 41 or 4% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the district over same period). Gilmorton Parish Council is planning to lead on the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. The primary school site in Gilmorton is confined and is reaching capacity. The closest healthcare facilities are at Lutterworth. The surgeries have capacity to accommodate growth but additional equipment would be needed. S106 contributions towards the provision of additional GP surgery equipment would be sought. There are shortfalls in some types of open space.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities, it is unclear whether the scale of growth would have a significant effect in this respect. Negative effects on the primary school are likely as is the strain on healthcare facilities. Development contributions would be sought to support improvements, but it would be difficult to provide new facilities locally.					
Significance	Scenario 1 could increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. This scenario supports residents to remain in the area by improving housing choice and affordability, could support the viability of new amenities and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. It would be likely that new health and education facilities would need to be provided outside the settlement, which limits the positive effects. On balance a minor positive effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would have similar effects to Scenario 1. Although the positive effects would be less pronounced, there would also be slightly less pressure on local services and the scale of growth is moderate. Therefore, a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would provide a lower amount of growth, so would be less likely to put pressure on services, but there would be slightly fewer opportunities to enhance facilities through contributions. There would also be lower amounts of housing provided in Gilmorton, but alternative opportunities for housing and employment would exist at Lutterworth SDA.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	There is potential for development to increase areas of impermeable land, which could contribute to increased surface water run-off.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no areas of risk from fluvial flooding. Surface water flooding presents a risk in some parts of the settlement, although not at those sites identified as deliverable in the draft SHLAA (2015).					
Likelihood of effects	The likelihood of development being in areas at risk of flooding is low, as is the likelihood that development would increase flood risk elsewhere, as there would be a requirement to ensure that surface water run-off is managed and SuDS utilised where necessary.					
Significance	It is unlikely that any of the scenarios would lead to development in areas at risk of flooding. The scale of development is unlikely to have a substantial effect on surface water run-off, and in any case, policies in the Plan would seek to ensure that no negative impacts occurred. Therefore, neutral effects are predicted for each scenario.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenarios 1-3 would support the development of housing growth in Gilmorton, helping to reverse population decline and deliver housing to meet local needs. Scenario 3 would also involve significant housing and employment nearby in an SDA at Lutterworth, which may be beneficial to residents in Gilmorton. Housing growth would also help to support the vitality of the village, having a positive effect the local economy.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Between 2001 and 2011 there was a decrease of 41 or 4% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the district over same period.					
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient land in the draft SHLAA (2015) to meet the housing numbers under all three scenarios.					
Significance	Scenario 1 should improve housing choice and affordability in Gilmorton and support the vitality of the local village. This would help to revert population decline and constitutes a moderate positive effect. Scenario 2 would have similar effects to Scenario 1, but at a lesser scale, and thus a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would have similar effects to Scenario 2, but also offers increased access to jobs and housing at the SDA in Lutterworth, which could lead to a moderate positive effect.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	✘	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Additional development under Scenarios 1-3 could lead to increased use of resources through the need for energy and water in new development, and the generation of increased car trips. The effects would be small scale, as the growth involved is not substantial under any scenario.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Great Glen has a relatively high figure for carbon emissions per person from domestic gas and electricity consumption (based on 2011 data), at 2.3 tonnes per person. Almost 10% of households rely on electric heating, causing higher emissions, but also increasing the risk of fuel poverty. There are also a significant number of homes reliant on oil; these emissions are not reflected in these figures. Great Glen also has a high proportion of detached homes, which may have higher heating needs.						
Likelihood of effects	Although access to mains gas and electricity is limited for some properties, it ought to be available for new development. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Great Glen and any new development would be unlikely to change this. There are reasonable bus services into Leicester and Market Harborough, but the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue at least in the short term.						
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Gilmorton; which as a sustainable rural village only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport and the likelihood of new school places being provided outside the village, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 and 2. Scenario 3 would lead to more modest growth and although there would still be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be as significant (i.e. they would be neutral).						

Summary of effects for Gilmorton

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✘	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✘	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✘	✘	-

Great Bowden

Scenarios tested for Great Bowden

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Great Bowden to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Great Bowden. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (102-114 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Great Bowden is well related to Market Harborough and is likely to benefit from employment opportunities in this area. There are also rail links, which make it possible to commute further to other centres of employment such as Leicester. It is unlikely that a difference of 4 or 10 ha of employment in Lutterworth would have any effect on Great Bowden. However, Kibworth is fairly close (less than 10km), and a 5 ha employment site in the SDA could be accessed easily by car. Therefore, Scenarios 2 and 3 have been divided into sub options to differentiate between those options that involve an SDA and those that don't.
2a	Moderate-growth (54-83 dwellings)	2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		6		*10 ha*			*23 ha*	
2b	Moderate-growth (49-68 dwellings) with SDA nearby	5, 7	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3 ha*	*22 ha*	
3a	Low growth (31-33 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*			*23 ha*	
3b	Low growth (24 dwellings) with SDA nearby	9	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	*5 ha*	*3ha*	*28 ha*	

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	×	Scenario 3a	-
			Scenario 2b	×	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 2 and 3 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1, 2 and 3) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. Great Bowden Borrow Pit SSSI is located to north of village. The SSSI is designated for fen, marsh and swamp lowland value. It is less than 500m away from one of the sites identified in the SHLAA (2014) which may potentially come forward for development following the site assessment process. The effects are currently unknown. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Great Bowden Borrow Pit SSSI is to the north of village. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Great Bowden is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects on Great Bowden Borrow SSSI would be unlikely, as long as development is appropriately designed. Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement.					
Significance	Although Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2 and 3, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1, 2 and 3, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	×	Scenario 3a	-
				Scenario 2b	×	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 2 and 3 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Great Bowden is one of the oldest settlements in Leicestershire due to its Anglo-Saxon origins and its character would need to be respected by any new development. The majority of the village form is in a Conservation Area. Grand Union Canal Conservation Area runs to the west of the village and forms the parish boundary. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Scenario 3 has the potential to affect the character to a lesser extent.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Great Bowden is largely in a Conservation Area and contains 56 listed buildings including a Grade I (Church of St Peter and St Paul) and a Grade II (The Old Rectory). The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development. There is a 'saved' Local Plan policy EV/3 that seeks to maintain an Area of Separation between Great Bowden and Market Harborough.						
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. This could also create a contrast between the 'new' and 'old' development. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenarios 2 and 3, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. It is unlikely that development would affect the physical and visual area of separation known as 'Bowden Ridge'; although its sensitivity would need to be respected. There is sufficient land available to meet requirements under scenario 1 without having to develop sensitive areas to the south. However, it is unclear which sites would be allocated for development at this stage.						
Significance	Scenario 1 has the potential for negative effects on the settlement edge of Great Bowden. Given that the importance of maintaining areas of separation with Market Harborough it is likely that development would not occur to the south of the settlement. Nevertheless, housing is fairly low density, overlooking green space, and this would be permanently altered if substantial development occurred. In the context of Great Bowden, this constitutes a moderate negative effect. For Scenario 2, the effects would be similar in nature, but the potential to deliver lower density / smaller scale development would be increased, hence only a minor negative effect is predicted. The effects of Scenario 3 are considered to be neutral as the scale is smaller still. **Recommendation –** Development in Great Bowden ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.						

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 3a	✖
			Scenario 2b	✓	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	The proportion of the population under 55 in Great Bowden is well down when compared to the District. Conversely the 55 and over age groups are all well above the District levels and the level of pensioner only households is relatively high. Housing growth would help to improve choice and affordability, which ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing. Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (to a lesser extent) would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2 would be more likely to help to support the vitality of village services as they would deliver more housing to the area.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The primary school in Great Bowden is at capacity and it is noted in the Settlement Profile that the site is constrained with limited space to extend. GPs in Market Harborough are also at capacity and would be affected by significant development. There are limited facilities in the village, although do currently cater adequately for the current population. Public transport links are not frequently used by the majority of the population as 65% of trips are by car and 10% work from home (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. However, this Scenario ought to improve housing choice and affordability, and support the vitality of the village. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of a new village amenities, it is unclear whether this would occur, or if the scale of growth would be adequate. Negative effects on the primary school are likely as is the strain on the GP in Market Harborough. Development contributions would be sought to support improvements.					
Significance	Scenario 1 is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. It would also create demand for school places that would probably need to be provided in Market Harborough rather than Great Bowden given the constraints at the current school site. However, this scenario would also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. It should also support the vitality of the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the likelihood of this is unclear. On balance a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2a would have similar effects, albeit at a lesser scale, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2b would be slightly more positive as there would be improved access to jobs at Kibworth SDA. Scenario 3a supports a lower level of housing development in Great Bowden, which may affect the availability of housing and ability to secure enhancements to community infrastructure. There is also low levels of growth in Market Harborough under this scenario, which would further compound					

	these issues. This is considered to be a minor negative effect. For Scenario 3b, there would be improved access to jobs and housing at Kibworth SDA which might help to offset these negative effects to an extent. Therefore a neutral effect is predicted.

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	**Scenario 1**	**-**	**Scenario 2a**	**-**	**Scenario 3a**	**-**
			Scenario 2b	**-**	**Scenario 3b**	**-**
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b and 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenarios 2 and 3 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3, which would require the development of greenfield land. Area to the south east of the village around the River Welland is identified as Flood Zone 2 and 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood zones 2 and 3 are identified around the River Welland but they do not affect the main village or sites identified in the SHLAA in the plan period.					
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all scenarios.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 3a	✖
			Scenario 2b	✓✓	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as there are plans to upgrade in 2015/16. This would help supplement the current 10% of residents who work from home. Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a/2b would help to improve housing choice and affordability in Medbourne, with knock on beneficial effects on the village economy, through increased spending on local services. Scenarios 3a/3b would limit these opportunities. More people are likely to lead to more economic activity in Market Harborough with Great Bowden only a short distance away.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been an increase of 8.6% dwellings since 2001 in Great Bowden. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 1% of economically active people in Great Bowden who are unemployed (Census 2011). This shows a strong local economy, without the need for economic development.					
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Great Bowden. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, than Scenario 2 and 3. Current infrastructure however may be stretched with this higher growth option, and contributions to improve highways might be required. Whilst there are relatively few employers in Great Bowden itself, the village benefits from its close proximity to Market Harborough and a wider range of employment opportunities. An increased housing offer would provide the opportunity for people to access these jobs and services. Scenario 3a and 3b would involve low levels of growth in Market Harborough which could compound effects on housing availability in Great Bowden and surrounding areas. For 3b this could be offset slightly through new homes delivered on Kibworth SDA.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1 or 2, ought to have a positive effect upon housing choice and the local economy through improved choice and local spending. Access to jobs would also be good given the proximity to Market Harborough (and Kibworth SDA for Scenario 2b). A moderate positive effect is predicted for Scenario 1 and a minor positive effect for Scenario 2a. Scenario 3a supports a lower level of housing development in Great Bowden, which may affect the availability of housing. There are also low levels of growth in Market Harborough under housing option 8, which would further compound these issues. This is considered to be a minor negative effect. For Scenario 3b, there would be improved access to jobs and housing at Kibworth SDA which might help to offset these negative effects to an extent. Therefore a neutral effect is predicted.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 3a	-
				Scenario 2b	-	Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3 would increase resource use in Great Bowden, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There would also be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which would increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2 and 3. Scenario 4 would have no effect on resource use as it promotes no growth.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in the 'rural' areas such as Great Bowden. As such there is a reliance on private transport. However, there is close proximity to Market Harborough which has excellent transport links.						
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available in Great Bowden, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Great Bowden and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable day time bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.						
Significance	There will The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Great Bowden; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). However, this would be offset by the fact that Great Bowden has close links with Market Harborough, which has excellent transport links and is well serviced by jobs and facilities (thus the length of trips is likely to be less). Consequently a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenarios 2 and 3 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Great Bowden. Therefore, although there could be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral).						

Summary of effects for Great Bowden

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b	Scenario 3a	Scenario 3b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗	✗	✗	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗	✗	✗	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	✓	✗	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✗	-
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	-	-	-

Great Easton

Scenarios tested for Great Easton

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Great Easton to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Great Easton. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate growth (43-51 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	There are variations in employment provision at Kibworth Fleckney and Lutterworth for the options grouped under Scenario 2 (options 2, 4 5, 6, 7) and Scenario 3 (options 3, 8, 9). However, it is likely that the effects of employment provision for Great Easton would be the same regardless of variations in employment land provision across the 9 options. This is because access to jobs from Great Easton is more likely to be at larger nearby towns such as Corby and Market Harborough, for which employment land provision is consistent across the 9 options. Employment provision in Lutterworth and Kibworth would be less likely to benefit Great Easton given that Lutterworth is over 40km away and Kibworth 24km.
2	Low-Moderate growth (14-32 dwellings)	2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7		*4 ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
		6		*10*	*5 ha*		*28 ha*	
3	Low growth (5-7 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes Magna Park*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1 and 2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Conversely, development can also present opportunities for enhancement. There would be a limited effect on natural resources with Scenario 3 as growth would be very low. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Eyebrook Reservoir SSSI is 0.8km to the north of the village and Eyebrook Valley Woods SSSI is 3km north of the village. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Great Easton is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement. There is likely to be greater environmental effects the higher the growth option. Effect upon the SSSIs are unlikely to be significant given that the scale of growth and distance from the settlement. Only one site has been identified in the SHLAA (2014) at the time of appraisal. If this site was to be developed, effects would on SSSIs would be unlikely.					
Significance	Although Scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Consequently, a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable. However, the scale of growth is not considered likely to constitute significant effects. There would be no effect under Scenario 3.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 has the potential to affect the character to a certain extent. It is not an issue for Scenario 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Great Easton is in a Conservation Area and contains 46 listed buildings including a Grade II (Church of St Andrew). The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development. Over 65% of houses in Great Easton are detached.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. However, the only deliverable site identified in the SHLAA has sufficient capacity to deliver the housing targets under each scenario at a low density. Therefore, it ought to be possible to mitigate effects through good design. Having said this, development would be likely to be adjacent to the Conservation Area, which could potentially be affected by new development.					
Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 have the potential for negative effects on landscape and heritage assets. Given that only one deliverable site has been identified in the SHLAA, it is assumed that development would be likely to occur in this area, and thus the character of the south of the settlement would be affected. Development in other areas could also have a negative effect, but it is unclear at this stage if there are any development sites in these areas. It ought to be possible to mitigate effects by securing sensitive low density design. However, a minor negative effect has predicted at this stage for Scenario 1 due to its higher level of growth. **Recommendation –** Development in Great Easton ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA) and number of listed buildings would need to be respected. Although new development would be likely to fall outside the Conservation Area, it is considered that the design principles within the CA should also apply to new development.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✘
Nature of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2, housing provision would help to improve housing choice and affordability, which ought to have positive effects on residents in the village that wish to form a household or move to larger/specialise accommodation (for example young families). Without growth, as per Scenario 3, these effects would not occur, and this could lead to an erosion of community identify over time as local residents might need to look for alternative accommodation outside the village. Scenarios 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2 would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2 would be more likely to help to support the vitality of village shops and services as they would deliver more housing to the area. However, these effects are small scale.					
Sensitivity of receptors	In Great Easton the proportion of the population aged 75 and over is well above the District average. The percentages in the 16-34 age groups are very low compared to the District. Overall the village has an aging population, with 25% of people over 65 (Census 2011). The primary school in Great Easton is close to capacity. However, it is noted that the site may be able to be expanded with S106 contributions. There are limited facilities in the village. Public transport links are not frequently used and 78% of people use a car or van to get to work, which is higher than the district average of 71%. Just over 11% work from home (Census 2011). The SHLAA site identified as possible for development would need to consider the extent of the Gas Pipeline Buffer area as a potential safety issue.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities and shops, but it is unlikely that these effects would be significant. Expansion of the primary school may be possible, but it is unclear what the maximum capacity would be. Therefore uncertain effects are predicted for Scenario 1. For Scenario 3, there is likely to be no effect on greenhouse gas emissions associated with new development due to the lack of growth. However, a lack of housing development would limit housing choice, which could have a negative effect on health and wellbeing in the longer term.					
Significance	Scenario 1 is likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, it would also improve housing choice in the area and could help to enhance open space through developer contributions. Although development would put pressure on schools and health facilities, contributions from development ought to support enhancements (although these may not be in the village). On balance a neutral effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would have similar effects but at a smaller scale, and thus a neutral effect is also predicted. Scenario 3 does not support new development in Great Easton, which may affect the availability of housing. Although community identity would be preserved in the short term, there could be a decline in the villages housing offer in the longer term, which may lead to young people having to move away affecting community spirit and diversity. Although Scenario 3 would put less pressure on schools and health, there would also be fewer opportunities to enhance community infrastructure and open space. Therefore a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 3.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 3 would not involve any development, so effects would be neutral.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Areas around Eyebrook, through centre of the village and to west of the village are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Southern part of parish within flood zones 2 and 3 (River Welland) also. These areas however are unlikely to be developed based on the land put forward in the SHLAA. There is no risk on land close to Bringhurst Primary School.					
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all 3 scenarios.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✘
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would lead to housing provision in Great Easton, which would contribute to meeting housing needs and improving choice. Scenario 3 would not affect the levels of house building, which could have negative effects in terms of not meeting local need. New homes could also help support the rural economy with more people spending money at existing services, although this is not likely to have a significant effect. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help supplement the current 11% of residents who work from home.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been an increase of 14% dwellings since 2001 in Great Easton. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 1% of economically active people in Great Bowden who are unemployed (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Great Easton. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, than Scenario 2. One site has been identified in the SHLAA, with potential to accommodate over 100 dwellings. If this site was developed, it would meet the housing targets in all three scenarios. Therefore, housing would be likely to be secured whether it be at this site, or a combination of this and / or other (currently unidentified sites).					
Significance	Scenario 1 will have a positive effect on delivering housing (including the provision of affordable housing) and supporting the village economy. A minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would have similar effects but at a lesser scale, hence neutral effects are predicted. Scenario 3 would not result in any growth and as a result would have a negative effect in terms of providing affordable, sustainable and good quality housing.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There will also be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2. Scenario 3 would have no effect on resource use.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in the rural areas such as Great Easton. As such there is a reliance on private transport. As a rural area, it is probable that a proportion of households would be reliant on 'off the grid' energy sources.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available in Great Easton, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Great Easton and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable day time bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Great Easton; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Great Easton. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral). Scenario 3 would limit further greenhouse gas emissions from Great Easton, and growth would be delivered at SDAs or urban areas that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. This ought to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted for this scenario.					

Summary of effects for Great Easton

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	-	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	-	-	✗
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓	-	✗
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✗	-	✓

Hallaton

Introduction

Scenarios tested for Hallaton

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Hallaton to assess the implications of the 9 strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Hallaton. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (52-68 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Although there is no employment provision in Hallaton, it is possible that an SDA in Kibworth (*which is accessible 7miles away along Langton Road*) would provide job opportunities that could be accessed by residents in Hallaton. Scenarios 2 and 3 involve the same scale of housing growth, but are differentiated in that scenario 3 would involve an SDA at Kibworth and Scenario 2 wouldn't. Differences in employment provision at Lutterworth are not expected to have any effect on Hallaton as there is almost 20miles between the two settlements. In any event, if residents in Hallaton were willing to seek work in Lutterworth, there are significant opportunities at Magna Park, which render differences in employment provision at Lutterworth insignificant.
2a	Moderate growth (23-45 dwellings)	3, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		6, 8		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
2b	Moderate growth (17-43 dwellings) with SDA at Kibworth	5, 7	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3 ha*	*22 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*			*28 ha*	

**Excludes Magna Park*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)		Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1 and 2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat of local importance such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, but cumulatively could be significant for Hallaton. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.				
Sensitivity of receptors	There are two Local Wildlife Sites, one to west of village adjacent to the brook at Glebe Farm Castle and Marsh (wet grassland) and one to the north of village close to dismantled railway which is a mature ash tree. There are also a number of TPOs in Hallaton. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Hallaton is classified as Grade 3.				
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement. There is likely to be greater environmental effects the higher the growth option. Although enhancement is possible, this only tends to be a feasible option on large sites with potential for substantial incorporation of green infrastructure.				
Significance	Although Scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures ought to limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. It may also be more difficult to achieve enhancement on small sites. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil for scenario 1.				

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2a	✘
				Scenario 2b	✘
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 as it involves a higher level of growth.				
Sensitivity of receptors	Hallaton is in a Conservation Area and contains 64 listed buildings and a Grade I Listed Church of St Michael and All Angels. There are also two Scheduled Monuments, the Hallaton motte and bailey castle (outside village) and the Butler Cross, 150m east of the Church. The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development. An aim of the Parish Plan is maintenance of the distinctive character of the village in regard to all future development propositions.				
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced.				
Significance	Housing is low density in Hallaton and if substantial development occurred it could alter the character in this location. If there is low delivery of housing, particularly lower density or smaller scale, only a minor negative effect is predicted (scenario 2). **Recommendation –** Development in Hallaton ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA), Scheduled Monuments and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.				

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)		Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2) will improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents to move to new homes, as either children move out or families expand. This ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing and help to maintain community identity. Scenarios 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2 would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenario 1 would be more likely to help to support the viability of village services as it would deliver more housing to the area, but the numbers involved are small. Higher levels of development could detract from the open, low density, historic setting in Hallaton which could affect community identity.				
Sensitivity of receptors	The population in Hallaton aged 0–15 is considerably higher than the District average, with over 25% of people aged 0-15. There are over 30% of people between 35-54. The primary school in Hallaton is close to capacity and it is noted that the site is constrained with limited space to extend existing school. There are a number of different facilities in the village, although do currently cater adequately for the current population. Public transport links are not frequently used, 74% of people use a car or van to get to work, which is higher than the district average of 71%. Just over 13% work from home at present too (Census 2011).				
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities, it is unclear whether this would occur, or if the scale of growth would be adequate to make a difference. Contributions to education and health facilities would be secured, but it is likely this would not be within Hallaton. Although new homes could benefit local communities, it is not possible to predict who would buy these homes.				
Significance	Scenario 1 will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, this scenario also supports residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing, which could be positive for community identity. Scenario 2a and 2b would have similar effects but at a smaller scale, and thus a neutral effect is predicted in this respect. However, for Scenario 2b, there would be employment growth in nearby Kibworth and Fleckney which could possibly support improved access to jobs. This ought to have a minor positive effect on health and wellbeing (although the need to tackle unemployment is not critical in Hallaton).				

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent 2, which would require the development of greenfield land.				
Sensitivity of receptors	There are Flood Zones 2 and 3 in Hallarton, largely to the south east and east of the main settlement boundary.				
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding based on the site identified in the SHLAA, however a larger growth option would potentially require new sites to be sought and then flood risk issues would need to be taken into consideration. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.				
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all each scenario.				

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2a	✓
			Scenario 2b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2) will improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents to move to new homes, as either children move out or families expand. Each scenario would also help to support the local village centre through increased local spending, though the effects would be negligible. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help support home working. For Scenario 2b, there would be significant housing and employment development in nearby Kibworth, which could be accessed by residents in Hallaton.			
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been an increase of 20.2% dwellings since 2001 in Hallaton. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 1% of economically active people in Hallaton who are unemployed (Census 2011).			
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Hallaton. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, than Scenario 2. There is sufficient land identified in the SHLAA 2015 to deliver the housing targets under each scenario.			
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1, ought to have a positive effect by improving housing choice and affordability, and is predicted to have a moderate positive effect. Scenarios 2a and 2b would provide a smaller amount of growth, yet would still have a minor positive effect. In terms of the economy and employment, no Scenario is likely to have a significant effect, although Scenario 1 would be most likely to support housing growth locally and increased spending in the village. Scenario 2b would also improve access to jobs and homes at Kibworth SDA (although unemployment is not a particular issue in Hallaton).			

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2a	-
				Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There will also be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions, albeit only a minor amount.				
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in the rural areas such as Hallaton. As such there is a reliance on private transport.				
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Hallaton and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable day time bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.				
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Hallaton; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Hallaton. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral).				

Summary of effects for Hallaton

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	××	×	×
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	-	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	×	-	-

Lubenham

Introduction

Scenarios tested for Lubenham

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Lubenham to assess the implications of the 9 strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Lubenham. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (87-95 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	Although there is no employment provision in Lubenham, it is possible that an SDA in Kibworth would provide job opportunities that could be accessed by residents in Lubenham fairly easily by car. Scenarios 3a and 3b involve the same scale of housing growth, but are differentiated in that scenario 3b would involve an SDA at Kibworth and Scenario 3a wouldn't.
2	Moderate growth (60-72 dwellings)	2, 4, 5,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3 ha*	*24 ha*	
3a	Low growth (29-49 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		7, 6		*10 ha*			*23ha*	
3b	Low growth (23-45 dwellings) with SDA	8	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	*5 ha*	*3 ha*	*22 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*			*28ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**For natural environment, there would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore reference to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1, 2 and 3) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. There are two local wildlife sites close to village: Orchard House Ash 1 (mature tree) and Orchard House Ash 2 (mature tree) lie on northern edge of village. There are also a number of TPOs, at Lime Tree house/Marton House/Meridian/The Chestnuts/Beech House/Ashtree House and Hideaway. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Lubenham is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	The higher growth under Scenario 1 and potentially the moderate growth option Scenario 2 are more likely to put pressure on environmental resources through the loss of greenfield land. Effects on designated local wildlife sites would be unlikely, as long as development is appropriately designed. Mitigation measures such as habitat buffers could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement.					
Significance	Although Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2 and 3, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1, 2 and 3, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)		Scenario 1	××	Scenario 2	×	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. The majority of the village form is in a Conservation Area. The A4304 runs through Lubenham can be seen as a significant barrier to movement around the village for children and the elderly. Significant development could increasingly 'split' the village in two. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Scenario 3 has the potential to affect the character to a certain extent.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Lubenham is largely in a Conservation Area and contains 17 listed buildings including a Grade I (Church of All Saints) and a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Old Hall moated site). The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development. The Core Strategy supports the continued separation of Lubenham and Market Harborough in policy.						
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that could alter its character. This could also create a contrast between the 'new' and 'old' developments. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2 and 3, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Development to the east of Lubenham could affect separation between Market Harborough and may also could be adjacent to an Ancient Scheduled Monument. Development to the north could have effects on the Conservation Area. Due to policy constraints, it is less likely that development would be too close to Market Harborough in the east, although this would need bearing in mind at higher levels of development. There are SHLAA sites identified to the west and south west of Lubenham, so it ought to be possible to avoid sensitive areas provided that these are deemed to be the most suitable overall (a site appraisal process will be undertaken to inform this).						
Significance	Housing is fairly low density and generally overlooking or within close proximity to green space in Lubenham. This could be permanently altered if substantial development occurred in this location. As a result, this constitutes a moderate negative effect for Scenario 1. For Scenario 2, the effects would be similar in nature, but the potential to deliver lower density or smaller scale development would be increased, hence only a minor negative effect is predicted. Scenario 3 is unlikely to have significant effects as the level of growth is low. **Recommendation –** Development in Lubenham ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area and number of listed buildings would need to be respected. Although new development would be likely to fall outside the Conservation Area, it is considered that the design principles within the CA should also apply to new development.						

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
					Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	New housing ought to support a wider choice for residents, and help to improve affordability for some residents. At higher levels of growth it is possible that community identify could be affected, which would have negative implications on wellbeing for some people. Scenarios 1, 2 and 3a/3b (to a lesser extent) would lead to increased pressure on the primary school and health facilities, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenarios 1 and 2 would be more likely to help to support the viability of village services as they would deliver more housing to the area and subsequent spending. The effects would be small scale though.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The population statistics in Lubenham are skewed by Gartree Prison, adding more middle aged people to the statistics, although what is clear from the 2011 Census is that there are not many 0-15 year olds (11%) compared to the District average (17%). Lubenham has an extremely activity community, with many village events held all year round. The primary school in Lubenham is at capacity and it is noted in the Settlement Profile that the site is constrained with limited space to extend. There are also significant parking problems. GPs in Market Harborough are also at capacity and would be affected by significant development. There are limited facilities in the village and public transport links are not frequently used by the majority of the population, with 54% of trips by car and 28% walking to work (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, the trend of car travel and parking problems are likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for Scenario 1) could help to support the viability village amenities, it is unclear whether the scale of growth would be adequate to have a notable effect. Pressure on the primary school is likely as is the strain on the GP in Market Harborough. However, development contributions would be sought to support improvements. Given the physical constraints to expansion, it is likely that new provision would be in Market Harborough. For Scenario 2 and 3b there would be increased access to jobs is Kibworth through the SDA, which could have positive implications, though this would unlikely to have significant effects on health and wellbeing. At higher levels of growth it may be necessary to review the potential for open space for residential development; this could have negative effects on health and wellbeing for residents in Lubenham.					
Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are likely to be accessed by car. However, this scenario also supports some residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. Scenario 1 could support the viability of the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the likelihood of this is unclear. The strain it would put on existing services would mean that education and health provision would have to be accessed in Market Harborough, which is not ideal. Consequently, a neutral effect is predicted for these scenarios. Scenarios 3a and 3b are predicted to have less positive effects due to the lower level of growth – however, this would mean that there was less pressure on open space, education and health, and so residents may be able to access facilities locally although they would remain at capacity. A neutral effect is predicted.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA objective 6)		Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	**There would be no different effects for scenarios 3a and 3b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Kibworth. Therefore references to Scenario 3 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3, which would require the development of greenfield land.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Flood zones 2 and 3 are identified around the River Welland but they do not affect the main village.						
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be at risk of river flooding, although in Scenario 1 if more sites are required, flood risk will need to be a consideration. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.						
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all 3 scenarios. For scenario 1, the potential for surface water to pose a risk to development might be increased as there would be a greater need for Greenfield Land near to areas affected by surface water flooding. Therefore an uncertain negative effect is predicted.						

Housing and Economy (SA objectives 7 and 8)		Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓✓	Scenario 3a	✓
						Scenario 3b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 and 3a/3b) ought to improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents to move to new homes. Each scenario would also help to support the local village centre through increased local spending, though the effects would be negligible. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help support home working. For Scenario 2, there would be significant housing development in nearby Market Harborough, which could be accessed by residents in Lubenham. For Scenario 3b, an SDA in Kibworth ought to provide enhanced access to employment for residents in Lubenham, but Market Harborough would still be more accessible. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high speed broadband exists in the area, and this would help support home working. More people are likely to lead to more economic activity in Market Harborough with Lubenham only a short distance away.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been an increase of 12% dwellings since 2001 in Lubenham. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are 3% of economically active people in Lubenham who are unemployed (Census 2011). There is a strong local economy, with businesses such as Deichmann Shoes present. Increased housing in the area could provide places for people to live close to their work, as currently almost 30% of people walk to work.						
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Lubenham. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, than Scenario 2 and 3. Current infrastructure however may be stretched with this higher growth option, and contributions to improve highways would be required. As well as the employers in Lubenham itself, the village benefits from its close proximity to Market Harborough its wide range of employment opportunities. An increased housing offer would provide the opportunity for people to be in close proximity to jobs. There is sufficient land identified in the SHLAA to meet housing targets under each scenario. Clearly, with higher levels of growth the choice becomes limited as more sites need to be allocated.						
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenarios 1 and 2, will have a positive effect on delivering housing targets (including the provision of affordable housing) and also providing homes for people close to jobs they can walk to. This constitutes a moderate positive effect. Scenarios 3a and 3b would provide a smaller amount of growth, and thus only a minor positive effect is predicted. In terms of the economy and employment, no Scenario is likely to have a significant effect, although Scenario 1 would support a higher level of local spending.						

Resource Use (SA objective 9)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3a	-
						Scenario 3b	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3a/3b would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There will also be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2 and 3. However, the close proximity of Lubenham to Market Harborough could actually encourage more sustainable modes of travel such as walking to work. Scenario 4 would have no effect on resource use as it promotes no growth.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in the rural areas such as Lubenham. There is a limited bus service in the day, although a higher proportion of residents walk and cycle to work from Lubenham compared to the District Average. Once in Market Harborough, there is also good access to public transport links such as the rail station.						
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available in Lubenham, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. The capacity of the sewerage system is identified locally as an issue however and this would need o investigated further if any development was put forward. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Lubenham and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there is the day time bus service, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue. However, there are trends of higher rates of walking and cycling, which could be promoted to continue through new development.						
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Lubenham; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute To more car trips. However, Lubenham has close access to Market Harborough and a trend of higher rates of walking and cycling. Therefore, only a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenarios 2 and 3 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Lubenham. Therefore, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral).						

Summary of effects for Lubenham

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3a	Scenario 3b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	××	×	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	-	-	-	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	-	-

Medbourne

Scenarios tested for Medbourne

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Medbourne to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Medbourne. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate growth (34-47 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	There are variations in employment provision at Kibworth Fleckney and Lutterworth for the options grouped under Scenario 2 (options 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) and Scenario 3 (options 3, 8, 9). However, it is likely that the effects of employment provision for Medbourne would be the same regardless of variations in employment land provision across the 9 options. This is because access to jobs from Medbourne is more likely to be at larger nearby towns such as Corby and Market Harborough, for which employment land provision is consistent across the 9 options. Employment provision in Lutterworth would be less likely to benefit Medbourne given that Lutterworth is over 30km away. An SDA in Kibworth with 5ha of employment land could potentially have positive effects for residents in Medbourne, but these would not be anticipated to be significant given Medbournes' close connections with Corby and Market Harborough.
2	Low-Moderate growth (19-29 dwellings)	4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7		*4 ha*	*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
		6		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
3	Low/no growth (0-13 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*	-		*23ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Medbourne

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1 and 2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat such as hedgerows and trees. Effects would be small scale, permanent and would occur in the short, medium and long term. There would be no effect on the natural environment with Scenario 3 as little growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity. *Environmental quality* There could be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have a significant effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is one Local Wildlife Sites, Nevill Holt Quarry which is mesotrophic grassland. There are also a number of TPOs in Medbourne. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees and other habitats of local wildlife value. Development near the brook to the north of Medbourne could potentially have negative effects. Agricultural land surrounding Medbourne is classified as Grade 3, with an area of Grade 2 agricultural land located adjacent to west of village and further areas close to north and east of village.					
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures could be secured as part of developments on affected sites to reduce impacts on biodiversity. This could also include the potential for enhancement. There is likely to be greater environmental effects the higher the growth option.					
Significance	Although Scenarios 1 and 2 (to a lesser extent) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable. For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil. There would be no effect under Scenario 3.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Almost the entire village is designated as a Conservation Area with many original structures dating as far back as the 16th century. Effects on this built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. It is less of an issue for Scenario 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Medbourne is in a Conservation Area and contains Medbourne Bridge, a Scheduled Monument, along with four Grade II* Listed buildings, Bridge Dale Farmhouse, 8 Brook Terrace, Manor House, and Old Hall on Rectory Lane. There are 25 other Grade II buildings in Medbourne too. There may be some archaeological sites of value too. The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced. Scenario 3 would have no effect on built or natural heritage.					
Significance	Housing is very low density in Medbourne and if substantial development occurred it could alter the character in this location; thus a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. If there is lower delivery of housing, particularly lower density or smaller scale, a neutral effect is predicted as per Scenarios 2 and 3. **Recommendation –** Development in Medbourne ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA), Scheduled Monuments and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	×
Nature of effects	Increased growth would support a greater choice of housing and present more opportunities to contribute to improvements to community infrastructure. This ought to have positive effects on health and wellbeing. A lack of growth could restrict housing opportunities, which could have a negative effect on health and wellbeing, as well as leading to increased outmigration in the longer term. Increase growth could put pressure on local services.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The population in Medbourne has an absence of those aged 16-34, which may be attributable to a lack of employment opportunities and affordability issues. The 35-64 age groups are particularly well represented in Medbourne. The primary school for Medbourne is in Medbourne, and is close to capacity. It is noted that the site may be able to be expanded with S106 contributions. There are a number of different facilities in the village, and currently cater adequately for the current population, but there are concerns with some facilities. Public transport links are not frequently used, and sporadic. Personal car reliance is high. 70% of people use a car or van to get to work and 17% work from home (Census 2011). Market Harborough and Corby are relied on as the primary service areas. The Parish Council have noted that the shop, village hall and post office may be at risk though. Losing these facilities would mean then people would have to travel elsewhere, which would be negative in terms of wellbeing and community identity.					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 3, there is likely to be no effect on greenhouse gas emissions associated with new development due to the lack of growth. For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be an increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue, particularly with the reliance for services in Corby and Market Harborough. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for Scenario 1) could help to support the viability of a new village amenities, it is unclear whether this would occur, or if the scale of growth would be adequate. However, several services have been identified as at risk, so growth in population can only be positive in this respect.					
Significance	Scenario 1 will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these options also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. These options could support the viability of amenities and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the likelihood of this is unclear. On balance a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 does not support new development in Medbourne, which may affect the availability of housing. Although community identity would be preserved in the short term, there could be a decline in the villages housing offer in the longer term, which may lead to young people having to move away affecting community spirit and diversity. On balance a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 3.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent 2, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 3 would not involve any development, so effects would be neutral. Flood Zones 2 and 3 are identified Area around brook running through the village. This would affect development and could constrain northern sites outlined in the SHLAA.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are Flood Zones 2 and 3 running through the main settlement boundary.					
Likelihood of effects	There is potential new development would be at risk of river flooding. This could affect the higher growth option, Scenario 1, as the developable area is reduced. This could happen to a lesser extent for Scenario 2. SUDs would almost certainly need to be part of any new development. Surface water run-off would also need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development if mitigated appropriately, although negative implications are more likely in Scenario 1. Where all the development in this Scenario would be located is uncertain however. A neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 2 and 3.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2	✓	Scenario 3	××
Nature of effects	There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as there are plans to upgrade in 2015/16. This would help supplement the current 17% of residents who work from home. Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 would help to improve housing choice and affordability in Medbourne, with knock on beneficial effects on the village economy, through increased spending on local services. Scenario 3 would limit these opportunities. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help supplement the current 13% of residents who work from home.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The 2011 Census found that 62.3% of households had 2 or more bedrooms than required. Growth in Medbourne could provide new housing types. There has been an increase of 14% dwellings since 2001 in Medbourne. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 2% of economically active people in Medbourne who are unemployed (Census 2011). The Parish Council have noted that the shop, village hall and post office may be at risk though. Losing these facilities would mean then people would have to travel elsewhere, which would be negative in terms of wellbeing and community identity.					
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Medbourne. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, than Scenario 2. Medbourne is within 7 miles of Market Harborough and 10 miles of Corby, both of which have an extensive range of services, facilities and employment opportunities. It is likely any new homes would provide places for commuters to these towns to live. This could help encourage local economic growth with new money coming in to the area.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1, ought to have a positive effect on delivering housing targets (including the provision of affordable housing) and addressing the shortfall currently present in Harborough. Scenario 2 will provide a lower amount of growth, and would be unlikely to need new infrastructure, but the positive effects would be less pronounced. Scenario 3 would result in very low or no growth and as a result would have a negative effect in terms of NOT providing affordable, sustainable and good quality housing. In terms of the economy and employment, Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent 2) could help to support the viability of local services which have been identified as at risk. These are potential positive effects. Scenario 3 would not offer these opportunities, which is a potential missed opportunity. A minor positive effect is predicted on housing and employment for Scenario 1, as it would help to support improved housing choice and potentially support the viability of at risk local services. The effects are similar for Scenario 2, but at a lesser scale, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted. A lack of growth in Medbourne would not help to support local housing provision and would also not contribute towards the support of local services. Hence a moderate negative effect is predicted.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There will also be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2. Scenario 1 could help to support the viability of local services which have been ideitnfied as 'at risk'. A loss of these services could lead to more trips, so on another hand, higher growth in Medbourne might actually be beneficial in terms of reducing carbon emissions. Scenario 3 would have no limited effects on resource use, aside from not encouraging growth in an area that is not well served.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is relatively poor in Medbourne. As such there is a reliance on private transport. The Parish Council have noted that the shop, village hall and post office may be at risk though. Losing these facilities would mean then people would have to travel elsewhere, leading to increase car trips and associated emissions.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Medbourne and any new development would be unlikely to change this. Although there are reasonable day time bus services, the majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Medbourne; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). However, Scenario 1 could help to support the viability of local services which have been identified as 'at risk'. A loss of these services could lead to more trips; so on another hand, higher growth in Medbourne might actually be beneficial in terms of reducing carbon emissions. Therefore, on balance a neutral effect is predicted. Scenario 2 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Medbourne. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral). Scenario 3 would limit further greenhouse gas emissions and growth would be delivered at SDAs that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. This ought to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. However, on the other hand, a lack of growth would not help to support the viability of at risk services, and the loss of such services could lead to increased emissions. Therefore, on balance a neutral effect is predicted.					

Summary of effects for Medbourne

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	×	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	-	×
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	××
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	?	-	✓

North Kilworth

Scenarios tested for North Kilworth

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for North Kilworth to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for North Kilworth. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate growth (31-47 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in North Kilworth. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in North Kilworth in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Lutterworth as they are some distance away.
2a	Low growth no SDA in Lutterworth (6-24 dwellings)	3,4,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*15 ha*	
		5,7			*5 h*		*22 ha*	
2b	Low growth SDA in Lutterworth (6-24 dwellings)	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

*Excludes strategic distribution sector

SA findings for North Kilworth

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**For natural environment, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats of local importance such as grassland, hedges and trees. The magnitude of effects would not be high. *Environmental quality* - There is the potential for loss of land classified as Grade 2/3 under Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent scenario 2. Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. The level of growth is not substantial enough to have a significant effect though.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Local species of importance include bats and badges. The Bogs (wetland) and Millennium Green with its unique wetland Ecology are also important local sites as well as the dismantled railway line. Grade 3 agricultural land surrounds the settlement.					
Likelihood of effects	It is likely that effects on biodiversity could be avoided through sensitive layout and design. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land of Grade 3 under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car are likely to increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges.					
Significance	For Scenario 1, a minor negative effect is predicted as there could be a loss of agricultural land categorised as Grade 3. There is also the potential for effects on habitats and species of local importance. The effects are only considered to be minor as the surrounding areas are not particularly sensitive (and mitigation / enhancement ought to be possible), and the level of growth is not substantial. The effects of Scenario 2 would be similar to scenario 1, but at a lower scale, and hence a neutral effect is predicted.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2a	✘	Scenario 2b	✘
Nature of effects	**For built and natural heritage, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most notable for scenario 1, which involves a higher level of development.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Millennium Green (site of Norman wooden stockade and sub subsequently a manor house on moated mound). A Conservation Area covers most of the village.					
Likelihood of effects	Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an adverse effect on the character of the settlement. The small scale of growth ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated. However, the character of the settlement is likely to be affected given that the scale of the settlement will be altered and development would be adjacent to the Conservation Area.					
Significance	Development under scenario 1 could alter the character in this location; thus a moderate negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. If there is lower delivery of housing, particularly lower density or smaller scale, a minor negative effect is predicted as per Scenarios 2 and 2b. **Recommendation –** Development in North Kilworth ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA), Scheduled Monuments and number of listed buildings would need to be respected. Development adjacent to the Conservation Area ought to adopt the principles of the Conservation Area.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent) Scenarios 2a and 2b would require increased provision of local school and health provision. Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions. Scenario 2b would improve job opportunities in Lutterworth through the delivery of an SDA, which ought to have a positive effect on health for residents in North Kilworth that are able to benefit from these jobs. Lower levels of development ought to help preserve the community identity of the village, although in the longer term, this could have the opposite effect if sufficient housing is not available to support local residents.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Capacity of Husbands Bosworth GP practice. There is insufficient capacity to manage any increase in patient numbers and a new surgery is required. S106 Contributions towards the provision of a new GP surgery would be sought. Capacity of primary school. S106 contributions towards a primary school extension would be sought. Shortfall in types of open space. Appropriate S106 contributions would be sought where a shortfall in certain types of open space is identified.					
Likelihood of effects	For both scenarios the amount of growth proposed would not support a viable new primary school (assuming a dwelling/pupil ratio of 0.2). Therefore contributions would need to be sought to expand the existing school. The site ought to have capacity to extend. For both scenarios contributions would be sought to improve health facilities in Husbands Bosworth, so effects would be anticipated to be positive, albeit the health facilities would not be within the village. For both scenarios (more for Scenario 1) it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision, which could help to address any identified shortages.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would increase housing provision locally, having a positive effect on health and wellbeing. Development would also help to support the viability the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. These effects are considered to be a minor positive. The increased population would put pressure on the primary school and health facilities, but these could be managed through contributions to enhancements. Scenarios 2a and 2b would have similar effects but on a smaller scale. The lower levels of growth proposed under these scenarios ought to better preserve community identity. Overall, a minor positive effect is predicted for these 2 scenarios.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**For climate change, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and 2a/2b. The level of development proposed is fairly low under each scenario.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no areas at risk of fluvial flooding. Surface water flooding may present a risk throughout the settlement.					
Likelihood of effects	The majority of land surrounding North Kilworth is not at risk of fluvial flooding and hence effects would be unlikely in this respect for each Scenario. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. However, the total level of development proposed under each scenario is only small.					
Significance	The level of development on greenfield land associated with scenarios 1 and 2 have the potential to lead to an increase in surface water run-off. However, given the small scale of development, the effects are considered to be neutral.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a/2b) would deliver housing in North Kilworth, helping to improve housing choice and affordability. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the village. Scenario 2b would have additional benefits in terms of improved access to jobs at an SDA in Lutterworth.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 597 (increase of 119 or 25% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over the same period). The Parish Plan identified 13 companies within the parish employing more than 5 people. In addition there are other small companyies and self-employed businesses that operate from home. There are good road links to access jobs in Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Magna Park.					
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient land capacity identified in the draft SHLAA 2015 to deliver housing under all scenarios.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1, would have a positive effect on delivering housing (including the provision of affordable housing) in North Kilworth. Homes would also be well related to employment opportunities and ought to support the vitality of the local village. Scenario 2a would provide a lower amount of growth than Scenario 1, and so positive effects are predicted only to be minor. Scenario 2b would also provide lower housing growth, but would involve an SDA at Lutterworth which would provide alternative housing choice (albeit not in North Kilworth itself) and would also enhance employment opportunities. Consequently, the overall effect of Scenario 2b is predicted to be a moderate positive.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	**For resource use, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There would be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which could increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is reasonable from North Kilworth, but there is heavy reliance on private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon decentralised power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in North Kilworth and any new development would be unlikely to change this. The majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in North Kilworth; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services locally. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase (albeit insignificant) in greenhouse gas emissions across the district. Scenario 2a/2b would lead to lower growth, which ought to minimise further carbon emissions contributed from travel to and from North Kilworth – however, the effects are predicted to be neutral given that the level of emissions that would be offset is very low.					

Summary of effects for North Kilworth

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	××	×	×
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	-

South Kilworth

Scenarios tested for South Kilworth

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for South Kilworth to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for South Kilworth. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (46-59 dwellings)	1, 2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in South Kilworth. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in South Kilworth in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Lutterworth as they are some distance away.
		5			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
2a	Moderate growth no SDA in Lutterworth (6-24 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		7			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
2b	Moderate growth SDA in Lutterworth (16-32 dwellings)	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for South Kilworth

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2a	✘	Scenario 2b	✘
Nature of effects	**For natural environment there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* *Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats of local importance such as grassland, hedges and trees. There is also potential for recreational effects on Stanford Park SSSI. *Environmental quality* - There is the potential for loss of land classified as Grade 2 under Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Stanford Park is a SSSI comprising 20ha of broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland (lowland). Stanford Reservoir Reedbed (reedbed) is a local wildlife site of importance.					
Likelihood of effects	It is possible that effects on biodiversity could be avoided through sensitive layout and design. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land of Grade 2 under Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car are likely to increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges.					
Significance	For Scenario 1, a moderate negative effect is predicted as there could be a loss of agricultural land categorised as Grade 2. There is also the potential for effects on habitats and species of local importance and potential for effects on Stanford Park SSSI. The effects of Scenario 2 would be similar to scenario 1 but at a lower scale, and hence a minor negative effect is predicted.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2a	✘	Scenario 2b	✘
Nature of effects	**For built and natural heritage there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most notable for scenario 1, which involves a higher level of development.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is no Conservation Area, but South Kilworth contains 10 listed buildings, Stanford Hall (Registered Parks and Gardens) and two scheduled ancient monuments (Prehistoric settlement site 800m SW of village and Moated site and fishponds south west of Highfields Farm). The village is very small scale and rural in nature and could be sensitive to change.					
Likelihood of effects	Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an adverse effect on the character of the settlement. The small scale of growth for Scenario 2 ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated. However, the character of the settlement is likely to be affected given that the scale of the settlement will be altered.					
Significance	Development under scenario 1 could significantly alter the character in this location; thus a moderate negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. If there is lower delivery of housing, particularly lower density or smaller scale, a minor negative effect is predicted as per Scenario 2. **Recommendation –** Development in South Kilworth ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent) Scenarios 2a and 2b would require increased provision of local school and health provision. Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions. Scenario 2b would improve job opportunities in Lutterworth through the delivery of an SDA, which ought to have a positive effect on health for residents in South Kilworth that are able to benefit from these jobs. Lower levels of development ought to help preserve the community identity of the village, although in the longer term, this could have the opposite effect if sufficient housing is not available to support local residents.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Capacity of Husbands Bosworth GP practice. There is insufficient capacity to manage any increase in patient numbers and a new surgery is required. S106 Contributions towards the provision of a new GP surgery would be sought. Capacity of primary school. S106 contributions towards a primary school extension would be sought, but the site is constrained. Shortfall in types of open space. Appropriate S106 contributions would be sought where a shortfall in certain types of open space is identified.					
Likelihood of effects	For both scenarios the amount of growth proposed would not support a viable new primary school (assuming a dwelling/pupil ratio of 0.2). Therefore contributions would need to be sought to expand the existing school. The site is constrained though, so school provision would need to be outside of the settlement. For both scenarios contributions would be sought to improve health facilities in Husbands Bosworth, so effects would be anticipated to be positive, albeit the facilities would not be within the village. For both scenarios (more for Scenario 1) it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision, which could help to address any identified shortages.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would increase housing provision locally, having a positive effect on health and wellbeing. Development would also help to support the viability the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. These effects are considered to be a minor positive. The increased population would put pressure on the primary school and health facilities, but these could be managed through contributions to enhancements. Scenarios 2a and 2b would have similar effects but on a smaller scale. The lower levels of growth proposed under these scenarios ought to better preserve community identity. Overall, a minor positive effect is predicted for these 2 scenarios.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	**For climate change there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development at higher levels could mean that housing is in closer proximity to areas at risk of flooding. New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and 2. The level of development proposed is fairly low under each scenario.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Area around brook to the west of village is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Much larger area in Flood Zones 2 and 3 associated with the Upper River Avon. Surface water flooding may present a risk throughout the settlement.					
Likelihood of effects	Although there are some areas at risk of flooding around South Kilworth, it is likely that development would be located away from these areas. However, at higher levels of growth, there may be an increased possibility that development adjacent to flood risk areas would be necessary. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur, and the level of run off to sewers was not increased significantly. However, the total level of development proposed under each scenario is only small.					
Significance	Scenario 1 could lead to development close to areas of flood risk. As no potential sites have been identified in the draft SHLAA 2015, there is an uncertainty about where development could occur. Therefore an uncertain effect has been predicted. For Scenario 2, the effects are likely to be neutral given the lower levels of development (and thus it ought to be easier to avoid areas of flood risk). The level of development on greenfield land associated with scenarios 1 and 2 have the potential to lead to an increase in surface water run-off. However, given the small scale of development, the effects are considered to be neutral in this respect.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a/2b) could deliver housing in South Kilworth, helping to improve housing choice and affordability. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the village. Scenario 2b would have additional benefits in terms of improved access to jobs at an SDA in Lutterworth.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 513 (increase of 83 or 19% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over same period). There are good road links to access jobs in Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Magna Park.					
Likelihood of effects	There is insufficient land capacity identified in the draft SHLAA 2015 to deliver housing under any of the scenarios.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1, would have a positive effect on delivering housing (including the provision of affordable housing) in South Kilworth. Homes would also be well related to employment opportunities and ought to support the vitality of the local village. However, there is uncertainty about whether a higher level of growth could be delivered given that no land capacity has yet been identified in the settlement. Consequently, only a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 (this could be a moderate positive effect if the uncertainty around local land supply is resolved). Scenario 2a would provide a lower amount of growth than Scenario 1, and thus the potential for positive effects in minor. Scenario 2b would also provide lower housing growth, but would involve an SDA at Lutterworth which would provide alternative housing choice (albeit not in South Kilworth itself) and would also enhance employment opportunities. Consequently, the overall effect of Scenario 2b is predicted to be a minor positive effect (this could be a moderate positive effect if the uncertainty around local land supply is resolved).					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	**For resource use, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There would be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which could increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is reasonable from South Kilworth, but there is heavy reliance on private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon decentralised power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in South Kilworth and any new development would be unlikely to change this. The majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in South Kilworth; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services locally. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase (albeit insignificant) in greenhouse gas emissions across the district. Scenario 2a/2b would lead to lower growth, which ought to minimise further carbon emissions contributed from travel to and from South Kilworth – however, the effects are predicted to be neutral given that the level of emissions that would be offset is very low.					

Summary of effects for South Kilworth

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2a	Scenario 2b
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗✗	✗	✗
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗✗	✗	✗
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	?	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓	✓	✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	-	-	-

Swinford

Scenarios tested for Swinford

The table below sets out five distinct scenarios for Swinford to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Swinford. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (51-67 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Swinford. Provision differs from either 4ha for some housing options to 10ha for others. Higher provision of employment Land in Lutterworth ought to be more beneficial for residents in Swinford in terms of access to jobs. Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be beneficial to residents in Swinford as public transport links are poor between these settlements, and links to Lutterworth and strategic road networks are stronger.
2a	Moderate-high growth no SDA in Lutterworth (24-45 dwellings)	3, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5. 7			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
2b	Moderate growth SDA in Lutterworth (17-32 dwellings)	6, 8	*10 ha*	*10 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*23 ha*	
		9			*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Swinford

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)		Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* - Increased housing on greenfield land could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss and disturbance to wildlife habitats of local importance such as grassland, hedges and trees. The magnitude of effects would not be high. *Environmental quality* - There is the potential for loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, and to a lesser extent scenario 2. Higher levels of growth could affect local air quality if it leads to an increase in car trips to and through the village centre. The level of growth is not substantial enough to have a significant effect though.						
Sensitivity of receptors	Stanford Park is closest SSSI to Swinford (1.3k away). There are no designated local wildlife sites, but bats badgers, and Great Crested Newt could be present locally. Grade 3 agricultural land surrounds the settlement.						
Likelihood of effects	It is likely that effects on biodiversity could be avoided through sensitive layout and design. It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land of Grade 3 under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent Scenario 2. Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through the village centre by car are likely to increase, as development would be likely to occur on the settlement edges.						
Significance	For Scenario 1, a minor negative effect is predicted as there could be a loss of agricultural land categorised as Grade 3. There is also the potential for effects on habitats and species of local importance. The effects are only considered to be minor as the surrounding areas are not particularly sensitive (and mitigation / enhancement ought to be possible), and the level of growth is not substantial. The effects of Scenario 2 would be similar to scenario 1, but at a lower scale, and hence a neutral effect is predicted.						

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	✘✘	Scenario 2a	✘	Scenario 2b	✘
Nature of effects	**For built and natural heritage there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale and appearance of the settlement. This would be most notable for scenario 1, which involves a higher level of development.					
Sensitivity of receptors	A Conservation Area covers most of the village, as well as 10 listed buildings, part of Stanford Hall (Park and Gardens). There are a significant number of fields around the village where the ridge and furrow pattern can be seen. The village is very small scale and rural in nature and could be sensitive to change.					
Likelihood of effects	Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an adverse effect on the character of the settlement. The smaller scale of growth for Scenario 2 ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated. However, the character of the settlement is likely to be affected given that the scale of the settlement will be altered.					
Significance	Development under scenario 1 could alter the character in this location; and development may need to occur within and adjacent to the Conservation area; thus a moderate negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. If there is lower delivery of housing, particularly lower density or smaller scale, a minor negative effect is predicted as per Scenario 2. **Recommendation –** Development in Swinford ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent) Scenarios 2a and 2b would require increased provision of local school and health provision. Each of these scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space and community infrastructure through developer contributions. Scenario 2b would improve job opportunities in Lutterworth through the delivery of an SDA, which ought to have a positive effect on health for residents in Swinford that are able to benefit from these jobs. Lower levels of development ought to help preserve the community identity of the village, although in the longer term, this could have the opposite effect if sufficient housing is not available to support local residents.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Population of 586 (an increase of 90 or 18% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the District over the same period) There are local concerns about air quality; therefore there is great interest in maintaining and creating green areas (trees, hedgerows, gardens). S106 contributions would be sought towards the provision of required new equipment for GP surgeries in Lutterworth. S106 contributions towards primary school extension would be sought. Shortfall in types of open space. Appropriate S106 contributions would be sought where a shortfall in certain types of open space is identified.					
Likelihood of effects	For both scenarios the amount of growth proposed would not support a viable new primary school (assuming a dwelling/pupil ratio of 0.2). Therefore contributions would need to be sought to expand the existing school. No site constraints have been identified so it ought to be possible to extend. For both scenarios contributions would be sought to improve health facilities in Lutterworth, so effects would be anticipated to be positive, albeit the facilities would not be within the village. For both scenarios (more for Scenario 1) it is likely that development would secure enhancements to open space provision, which could help to address any identified shortages. Higher levels of growth would be more likely to contribute to air quality concerns. Conversely, they could present opportunities to enhance green infrastructure.					
Significance	Scenario 1 would increase housing provision locally, having a positive effect on health and wellbeing. Development would also help to support the viability the village centre and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions. The increased population would put pressure on the primary school and health facilities, but these could be managed through contributions to enhancements. On balance a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenarios 2a and 2b would have similar effects but on a smaller scale. The lower levels of growth proposed under these scenarios ought to better preserve community identity. Overall, a minor positive effect is predicted for these 2 scenarios.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)		Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2a	-	Scenario 2b	-
Nature of effects	There is potential for development to increase areas of impermeable land, which could contribute to increased surface water run-off.						
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no areas of risk from fluvial flooding within or around the village. Surface water flooding presents a risk in some parts of the settlement.						
Likelihood of effects	The likelihood of development being in areas at risk of flooding is low, as is the likelihood that development would increase flood risk elsewhere, as there would be a requirement to ensure that surface water run-off is managed and SuDS utilised where necessary.						
Significance	It is unlikely that any of the scenarios would lead to development in areas at risk of flooding. The scale of development is unlikely to have a substantial effect on surface water run-off, and in any case, policies in the Plan would seek to ensure that no negative impacts occurred. Therefore, neutral effects are predicted for each scenario.						

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓✓	Scenario 2a	✓	Scenario 2b	✓✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2a/2b) would deliver housing in Swinford, helping to improve housing choice and affordability. This would have a positive effect on housing and help to support the vitality of the village. Scenario 2b would have additional benefits in terms of improved access to jobs at an SDA in Lutterworth.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are good road links to access jobs in Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Magna Park.					
Likelihood of effects	There is sufficient land capacity identified in the draft SHLAA 2015 to deliver housing under all scenarios.					
Significance	A higher growth Scenario, such as in Scenario 1, would have a positive effect on delivering housing (including the provision of affordable housing) in Swinford. Homes would also be well related to employment opportunities and ought to support the vitality of the local village. Overall, a moderate positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2a would provide a lower amount of growth than Scenario 1, and so positive effects are predicted only to be minor. Scenario 2b would also provide lower housing growth, but would involve an SDA at Lutterworth which would provide alternative housing choice (albeit not in Swinford itself) and would also enhance employment opportunities. Consequently, the overall effect of Scenario 2b is predicted to be a moderate positive.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	✘	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	**For resource use, there would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiated on the basis of the provision of employment land in Lutterworth. Therefore references to Scenario 2 below covers both sub-options.* Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There would be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which could increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is poor from Swinford and there is heavy reliance on private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity ought to be available, so new development would not be dependent upon decentralised power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Swinford and any new development would be unlikely to change this. The majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Swinford; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate/poor access to services locally. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district. This constitutes a minor negative effect. Scenario 2 would lead to lower growth, which ought to minimise further carbon emissions contributed from travel to and from Swinford – however, the effects are predicted to be neutral given that the level of emissions that would be offset is low compared to the predicted baseline.					

Summary of effects for Swinford

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	××	×	×
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	✓	✓	✓
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	×	-	-

Tilton

Scenarios tested for Tilton

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Tilton to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Tilton. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	Moderate growth (28-32 dwellings)	1	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	There are variations in employment provision for the options grouped under scenario 2 (options 2,4,5,6,7) and scenario 3 (options 3, 8, 9). However, it is likely that the effects of employment provision for Tilton would be the same regardless of variations in employment land provision across the 9 options. This is because access to jobs from Tilton would largely be in Leicester or other large centres, and employment provision in Lutterworth and/or Kibworth would be less likely to be accessed. Therefore, variations in land provision at these SDAs would not affect the appraisal findings under scenarios 2 and 3.
2	Low - Moderate growth (12-22 dwellings)	2, 4	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
		6			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
3	Low growth (5-7 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Tilton

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1 and 2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat of local importance such as hedgerows and trees. There would be limited effects on natural resources with Scenario 3 as very low growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is an SSSI, Tilton Railway Cutting which is 2km east of village. The site is a 750m section of disused railway cutting. Leighfield Forest SSSI lies partly within the parish but it is some distance from village itself. There is a group TPOs at the Coppice and at Halstead Grange and a TPO at the Sycamores. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Tilton is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement. There is likely to be greater environmental effects with the higher the growth option. Effects on Tilton Railway Cutting would need to be considered. The SSSI Impact zone for Leighfield Forest only seeks applications above 100 dwellings to be assessed for potential impacts on the SSSI. The housing numbers under each scenario are lower than this, so impacts would not be anticipated.					
Significance	Although scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent 2 and 3) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable (although this would be very small scale). For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil.					

	There would be no effect under Scenario 3.

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Tilton has a rich history and much of the village is identified as an area of potential archaeological interest. It is within a Conservation Area. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The village sits in the Tilton Conservation Area boundary which incorporates the central part and southern arm of the village. Tilton contains 5 Scheduled Monuments and 19 listed buildings including Grade I Listed Church of St Peter. The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced. Scenario 3 would have a negligible effect on built or natural heritage.					
Significance	Housing is low density in Tilton, with some important heritage assets adding to the setting of the settlement. Therefore, a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 which involves a higher level of growth. Scenarios 2 and 3 would involve a lower level of growth and are therefore predicted to have a neutral effect. **Recommendation –** Development in Tilton ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA) and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2) will improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents to move to new homes, as either children move out or families expand. This ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing and help to maintain community identity. Scenarios 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2 would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenario 1 would be more likely to help to support the viability of village services as it would deliver more housing to the area, but the numbers involved are small. Higher levels of development could detract from the open, low density historic setting in Tilton which could affect community identity.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The population in Tilton has a greater proportion of those aged 65 – 74 than the District as a whole (14% to 10%). By contrast, the proportion in the 16-24 and 25-34 age groups are lower than the District figure by 5% in each case. 10% of people in Tilton said day to day activities are limited a little due to long term health problems or disability according to the Census.2011. There is primary school in Tilton and therefore development would put strain on neighbouring schools. New development would also impact on Billesdon GP practice. There are a limited number of different facilities in the village. There are no public transport links due to the withdrawal of the Rural Rider. 70% of people use a car or van to get to work, while 20% work from home (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities, it is unlikely that the scale of growth would be adequate to make a difference. Contributions to education and health facilities would be secured, but it is likely this would not be within Tilton even at higher levels of development for Scenario 1. Although new homes could benefit local communities, it is not possible to predict who would buy these homes.					
Significance	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent 2) will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these Scenarios also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. These Scenarios could support the viability of amenities and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the significance of this is negligible. Consequently, neutral effects are predicted for both Scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 3 supports very low levels of new development in Tilton which may affect the availability of housing in the longer term. Although community identity would be preserved in the short term, there could be a decline in the villages housing offer with an aging population and fewer younger people than elsewhere in the Borough. In the long term this could affect community spirit and diversity. There would also be fewer opportunities to enhance community infrastructure. On balance a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 3.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent 2, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 3 would not involve any development, so effects would be neutral. There are no Flood Zones identified in Tilton.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no Flood Zones identified in Tilton.					
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be sited where it is at risk of river flooding, however with a larger growth option if placed on differing sites, flood risk issues would need to be taken into consideration in more than one place. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all 3 scenarios.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	✓	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✗
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 and 3) will improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents (that wish to form a household) to move to new homes in the village. Each scenario would also help to support the local village centre through increased local spending, though the effects would be negligible, particularly for Scenario 3. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband is planned for the area in late 2015/16, and this would help support home working.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been a 17% increase in dwellings since 2001 in Tilton. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 3% of economically active people in Tilton who are unemployed (Census 2011). The economic activity rate among residents is very low compared to the District reflecting the ageing population profile.					
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Tilton. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, and diversity of housing than Scenarios 2 and 3. New residents are likely to access jobs outside of the village as local employment opportunities are limited. There is some uncertainty whether Scenarios 1 could deliver the level of housing proposed, as only capacity for 28 dwellings has been identified in the draft SHLAA (2015).					
Significance	Scenarios 1 ought to have a positive effect on housing and economy by improving housing choice and local spending. There is uncertainty over whether the full housing target could be delivered as sufficient capacity has not yet been identified, but the unidentified capacity is only 4 dwellings. Therefore, a minor positive effect is predicted. Scenario 2 could be delivered, although the effects would be small scale, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. Scenario 3 would not support much housing growth, and this could have a negative effect on choice and affordability, hence a minor negative effect is predicted.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There is likely to be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2 and 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is reasonable in Tilton in the day time with hourly services, although 70% of people still use a car or van to get to work, with 20% working from home. As such there is a reliance on private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Tilton and any new development would be unlikely to change this. The majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue. The likelihood of effects may be reduced as there is a proactive community in Tilton who pride themselves on caring for the environment and pushing themselves to be more sustainable. This was evidenced with their 'Sustainability Village of the Year' title in 2009.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Tilton; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Tilton. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral). Scenario 3 would limit further greenhouse gas emissions and growth would be delivered at SDAs or larger urban areas that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. This ought to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted for this scenario.					

Summary of effects for Tilton

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	✗	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	✗	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	-	-	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	?	-	✗
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	✘	-	✓

Tugby

Scenarios tested for Tugby

The table below sets out three distinct scenarios for Tugby to assess the implications of the nine strategic housing options and corresponding employment provision. The housing options and employment provision have been grouped into scenarios to reflect potential differential effects that the housing and employment options could have for Tugby. Therefore, if the level of housing and employment is anticipated to have very similar effects for certain options, then these have been grouped together to avoid duplication. The grouping of options has taken into account available land, the scale and rate of growth, and the sensitivity of receptors.

This part of appraisal does not consider effects 'outside' of Tugby; rather it provides a local view of what the implications might be for this specific settlement under various housing and employment options. Whilst this is useful to engage residents with the issues facing their local communities, it should also be borne in mind that the Local Plan (and SA) need to explore the implications at a strategic level. This means looking at how the options affect the district 'as a whole' and looking at cumulatve and synergistic effecgs between settlements. These strategic effects are addressed in the next section of the SA Report that brings together the individual settlement level appraisals and explores the effects of the housing and employment options 'as a whole'.

Scenario	Range of housing growth	Relevant Housing options	Local Employment provision*					Assumptions
			Market Harborough	*Lutterworth*	*Kibworth*	*Fleckney*	*Total*	
1	High growth (24-34 dwellings)	1, 2	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	There are variations in employment provision for the options grouped under scenario 2 (options 4,5,6,7) and scenario 3 (options 3, 8, 9). However, it is likely that the effects of employment provision for Tugby would be the same regardless of variations in employment land provision across the 9 options. This is because access to jobs from Tugby would largely be in Leicester or other large centres, and employment provision in Lutterworth and/or Kibworth would be less likely to be accessed. Therefore, variations in land provision at these SDAs would not affect the appraisal findings under scenarios 2 and 3.
2	Moderate-high growth (14-21 dwellings)	4,	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		5, 7			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
		6			*5 ha*		*22 ha*	
3	Low growth (7-9 dwellings)	3	*10 ha*	*4 ha*	-	*3 ha*	*17 ha*	
		8		*10 ha*	-		*23 ha*	
		9		*10 ha*	*5 ha*		*28 ha*	

**Excludes strategic distribution sector*

SA findings for Tugby

Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	*Biodiversity* Increased housing on greenfield land (Scenario 1 and 2) could have a negative effect on biodiversity through the loss of habitat of local importance such as hedgerows and trees. There would be limited effects on natural resources with Scenario 3 as very low growth would occur. However, there would also be limited opportunity for enhancement to biodiversity. *Environmental quality* There would be loss of land classified as Grade 3 under Scenario 1, 2 and to a lesser extent 3. The scale of development involved would not have an effect on levels of air quality or water quality.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There is an SSSI, Leighfield Forest, in Tugby, and although this lies partly within the parish, it is some distance from village itself. There are a few TPOs in Tugby but are unlikely to be affected by development. Open land for development may contain hedges and trees on the boundary of value to wildlife. Agricultural land surrounding Tugby is classified as Grade 3.					
Likelihood of effects	Mitigation measures could be secured as part of developments on affected sites. This could also include the potential for enhancement. There is likely to be greater environmental effects with the higher the growth option. The SSSI Impact zone for Leighfield Forest only seeks applications above 100 dwellings to be assessed for potential impacts on the SSSI. The housing numbers under each scenario are lower than this, so impacts would not be anticipated.					
Significance	Although scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent 2 and 3) present the potential for negative effects, mitigation measures could limit the effects on local wildlife. Nevertheless, Scenario 1 is recorded as a minor negative effect as the higher scale of growth would make it more difficult to avoid wildlife damage and disturbance. For Scenario 2, it is likely that these effects could be avoided more easily, and hence a neutral effect is predicted. If enhancement was secured through development, it is possible that a minor positive effect could be achieved in terms of biodiversity, but it is not possible to say with certainty at this stage if this would be the case. There would be a loss of agricultural land under Scenario 1 and 2, which would be unavoidable (although this would be very small scale). For Scenario 1 and to some extent 2, which involves greater levels of development, this constitutes a minor negative effect on soil. There would be no effect under Scenario 3.					

Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Development of edge of settlement sites could affect the character of the built and natural environment, by altering the scale of the settlement. Tugby has changed little since the 19th Century and as a result much of the village is identified as an area of potential archaeological interest. It is within a Conservation Area. Effects on built and natural heritage would be most prominent for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The village sits in the Tugby Conservation Area boundary which incorporates the majority of the village apart from Wellfield Close and Spinney Nook. Tugby contains 9 listed buildings including a Grade II* Listed Church of St Thomas Beckett. The area is largely rural in nature and the urban form is small scale, low density with a unique character that could be affected by significant development.					
Likelihood of effects	Effects could be mitigated through application of plan policies on design. However, at higher levels of development, there will be an inevitable change in the scale of the settlement that will alter its character. For Scenario 1 and to a certain extent Scenario 2, it would be likely that development would either be at a higher density, or would need to cover more land. Therefore, the effects on the character of the settlement would be more pronounced. Scenario 3 would have a negligible effect on built or natural heritage.					
Significance	Housing is low density in Tugby, with some important heritage assets adding to the setting of the settlement. Therefore, a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 which involves a higher level of growth. Scenarios 2 and 3 would involve a lower level of growth and are therefore predicted to have a neutral effect. **Recommendation –** Development in Tugby ought to be low density and carefully designed to ensure that it is in keeping with the scale and character of the settlement. The Conservation Area (CA) and number of listed buildings would need to be respected.					

Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2) will improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents to move to new homes, as either children move out or families expand. This ought to have a positive effect on health and wellbeing and help to maintain community identity. Scenarios 1 and (to a lesser extent) 2 would lead to increased pressure on the primary school, and would generate car trips to access employment and services, leading to a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions. Scenario 1 would be more likely to help to support the viability of village services as it would deliver more housing to the area, but the numbers involved are small. Higher levels of development could detract from the open, low density historic setting in Tugby which could affect community identity.					
Sensitivity of receptors	The population in Tugby has a far greater proportion of those aged 65 – 74 than the District as a whole (17% to 10%). By contrast, the proportion in the 0-15 age group is significantly lower than the District figure (17% compared to 21%). The primary school in Tugby has limited capacity although the site is constrained, with only limited space for an extension. New development would impact on Billesdon GP practice. There are a high number of pensioner only households (29%) and under occupancy of dwellings is at a high rate. There are a limited number of different facilities in the village. Public transport links are not frequently used; with 71% of people using a car or van to get to work. 16% work from home (Census 2011).					
Likelihood of effects	For Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2, it is likely that there would be a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions due to new residents being located in this settlement, which has a strong trend of car travel that is likely to continue. Whilst the increased growth under these Scenarios (more so for scenario 1) could help to support the viability of village amenities, it is unlikely that the scale of growth would be adequate to make a difference. Contributions to education and health facilities would be secured, but it is likely this would not be within Tugby at higher levels of development for Scenario 1. Although new homes could benefit local communities, it is not possible to predict who would buy these homes.					
Significance	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent 2) will increase greenhouse gas emissions, as jobs and facilities are very likely to be accessed by car. However, these Scenarios also support residents to remain in the area by providing new affordable housing. These Scenarios could support the viability of amenities and may also help to enhance open space through developer contributions, but the significance of this is negligible. Consequently, neutral effects are predicted for both Scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 3 supports very low levels of new development in Tugby which may affect the availability of housing in the longer term. Although community identity would be preserved in the short term, there could be a decline in the villages housing offer in the longer term affecting community spirit and diversity. There would also be fewer opportunities to enhance community infrastructure. On balance a neutral effect is predicted for Scenario 3.					

Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	Scenario 1	-	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	-
Nature of effects	New development could increase surface water run-off under Scenarios 1 and to a lesser extent 2, which would require the development of greenfield land. Scenario 3 would not involve any development, so effects would be neutral. There are no Flood Zones identified in Tugby.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There are no Flood Zones identified in Tugby.					
Likelihood of effects	It is unlikely that new development would be sited where it is at risk of river flooding, however with a larger growth option if placed on differing sites, flood risk issues would need to be taken into consideration in more than one place. Surface water run-off would need to be managed to ensure that surface water flooding did not occur. Plan policies would require that new development did not increase flood risk elsewhere and include SUDs, so the effects on other areas is also unlikely.					
Significance	Flood risk would be unlikely to be an issue for any of the development Scenarios; hence a neutral effect is predicted for all 3 scenarios.					

Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	Scenario 1	?	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	x
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 (and to a lesser extent Scenario 2 and 3) will improve the choice of housing, allowing existing residents (that wish to form a household) to move to new homes in the village. Each scenario would also help to support the local village centre through increased local spending, though the effects would be negligible, particularly for Scenario 3. There is potential for new homes to be plugged in to fibre optic networks, as existing high spend broadband exists in the area, and this would help support home working.					
Sensitivity of receptors	There has been a 10% increase in dwellings since 2001 in Tugby. There is a need for affordable housing in rural areas. There are only 2% of economically active people in Tugby who are unemployed (Census 2011). The economic activity rate among residents is very low compared to the District reflecting the ageing population profile.					
Likelihood of effects	Increased housing would improve the offer available in Tugby. Scenario 1 would likely bring about more affordable housing, and diversity of housing than Scenarios 2 and 3. New residents are likely to access jobs outside of the village as local employment opportunities are limited. There is some uncertainty whether Scenarios 1 and 2 could deliver the level of housing proposed, as only capacity for 9 dwellings has been identified in the SHLAA (2015).					
Significance	Scenarios 1 and 2 ought to have a positive effect on housing and economy by improving housing choice and local spending. However, there is uncertainty over whether the housing target could be delivered as sufficient capacity has not yet been identified. Therefore, an uncertain positive effect is predicted. Scenario 3 could be delivered, although the effects would be small scale, and hence a neutral effect is predicted.					

Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	Scenario 1	×	Scenario 2	-	Scenario 3	✓
Nature of effects	Scenario 1 and to a lesser extent 2 and 3 would increase resource use, with more homes needing power and water. However, this would be the case regardless of where development occurs. There is likely to be more car journeys made based on the current trend (reliance on car travel) which will increase greenhouse gas emissions. More car trips would be generated for Scenario 1, and less for Scenario 2 and 3.					
Sensitivity of receptors	Access to public transport is reasonable in Tugby in the day time with hourly services, although 71% of people still use a car or van to get to work, with 16% working from home. As such there is a reliance on private transport.					
Likelihood of effects	Access to mains gas and electricity would be available, so new development would not be dependent upon independent power sources such as oil heating, which lead to greater emissions of greenhouse gases compared centralised networks. Provision of district heating would be unlikely due to a lack of sufficient heat demand in Tugby and any new development would be unlikely to change this. The majority of people travel by private car, and this is likely to continue.					
Significance	The level of growth associated with Scenario 1 would lead to increased numbers of people living in Tugby; which as a sustainable rural village, only has moderate access to jobs and services. Coupled with a reliance on private transport, it is likely that the level of growth under this scenario would therefore contribute to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would lead to more modest growth, which is more in line with the historic level of growth in Tugby. Therefore, although there would be negative implications, the effects would not be anticipated to be significant (i.e. they would be neutral). Scenario 3 would limit further greenhouse gas emissions and growth would be delivered at SDAs or larger urban areas that are better served by transport links, services and jobs. This ought to contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and hence a minor positive effect is predicted for this scenario.					

Summary of effects for Tugby

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Natural Environment (SA Objectives 1 and 2)	×	-	-
Built and Natural Heritage (SA Objective 3)	×	-	-
Health and Wellbeing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)	-	-	-
Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6)	-	-	-
Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)	?	-	×
Resource Use (SA Objective 9)	×	-	✓