

# Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report

## Prepared by Harborough District Council On behalf of

Gilmorton Parish Council – The Qualifying Body

May 2018

## Contents

| 1. | Introduction  | 3  |
|----|---|----|
| 2. | Legislative Background                                    | 18 |
| 3. | Criteria for Assessing the Effects of Neighbourhood Plans | 18 |
| 4. | Assessment  | 20 |
| 5. | Screening Outcome   | 26 |

### i. Introduction

- 1.1 Harborough District Council has been asked by Gilmorton Parish Council to undertake this screening report for Strategic Environmental Assessment.
- 1.2 This screening report is used to determine whether or not the content of Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan (GNP) requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
- 1.3 The purpose of Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan is to reflect the desires of the community and consider through theme groups issues such as:
  - Maintaining the rural character of the area;
  - · Supporting an accessible countryside
  - · Improving or retaining local services and facilities
  - · Preventing Gilmorton from becoming a dormitory village
  - Protecting green areas in Gilmorton
  - Conserving local heritage
  - Housing needs
  - Transport issues especially parking problems, traffic speed and congestion
- 1.4 The vision for Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan is as follows:

#### Gilmorton in 2031

- Gilmorton's heritage is conserved
- Reduced impact of traffic
- Important green spaces are protected
- Good access to the countryside
- Housing development reflects local needs
- The character and beauty of the countryside is safeguarded
- Local services and facilities are retained
- 1.5 To achieve the vision, the following objectives have been established by the Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan specifically considers the following:

#### Policy G1: Countryside

The Countryside (land outside Limits to Development) as defined on the Policies Map) will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character, beauty, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and to ensure it may be enjoyed by all. Development in the Countryside will be limited to that which supports community uses, essential infrastructure and that is suitable for a rural location.

### Policy G2: Gilmorton Area of Separation

The open character of the Gilmorton Area of Separation, as defined on the adjacent map and the Policies Map, will be retained. The construction of new buildings or inappropriate uses of land which adversely affect this open character or the character and setting of Gilmorton village will not be supported. Any development proposal within the Areas of Separation must assess and address its impact on the setting of Gilmorton Village and the objective of separation and give specific attention to location, design and landscaping appropriate to the character of the area.

#### Policy G3: Locally Important Views

Development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape. Development should safeguard and, where possible, enhance the following important views and vistas (as set out in Appendix 1 of the Plan):

#### Policy G4: Public Rights of Way network

Development should protect Rights of Way and wherever possible create new links to the network.

#### Policy G<sub>5</sub>: Ecology and Biodiversity

Development should not harm the network of local ecological features and habitats which includes (as shown on the Policies Map):

- A. Hedgerow north-west of Cotes de Val
- B. Old Fishponds in corner of improved grassland
- C. Pond, bordering Peatling Road
- D. Pond between improved grassland and arable field
- E. Dismantled Railway
- F. Pond

New development will be expected to maintain and enhance existing ecological corridors and landscape features (such as watercourses, hedgerows and treelines) for biodiversity thus demonstrating overall net-gain. All new buildings should incorporate measures to enhance biodiversity.

#### Policy G6: Community Services and Facilities

Development that would result in the loss of the following facilities will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated that:

- A. it is no longer viable; and
- B. it is no longer needed by the local community; and
- C. it is not needed for any other community use or that the

facility is being replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity, quality and location:

Gilmorton Chandler C of E Primary School Gilmorton Village Store and Post Office Gilmorton Village Hall Playing fields pavilion Allotments

### Policy G7: Rural Economy

The sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings will be supported.

#### **Policy G8: Local Green Spaces**

The following sites have been designated as Local Green Spaces:

- A. Kimcote Road Playing Fields
- B. All Saints Churchyard
- C. Primary School Playing Fields
- D. Gilmorton Allotments
- E. Lutterworth Road Recreation Ground
- F. Jubilee Wood, Peatling Parva Road

Development that would harm the openness or special character of a Local Green Space (as designated on the Polices Map) or its significance and value to the local community will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Local Green Space.

#### Policy G9: Local Heritage Assets

The determination of planning applications which would affect features of local heritage interest (as listed below and shown on the Policies Map) will balance the need for or public benefit of the proposed development against the significance of the asset and the extent to which it will be harmed:

- A. The Crown Inn, Lutterworth Road
- B. The Grey Goose, Lutterworth Road
- C. Methodist Chapel, Main Street
- D. Sleath Farm, Ashby Road
- E. Old Post Office, Lutterworth Road
- F. Bent's Farmhouse, Church Drive

Within the historic settlement cores of Gilmorton and Cotes de Val planning applications should be accompanied by an appropriate desk-based archaeological assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

### Policy G10: Housing Provision

This Plan makes provision for 165 dwellings over the period 2011 to 2031. This will be met by:

A. Existing commitments; and

B. Development within the Gilmorton Limits to Development in accordance with Policy G 11.

#### Policy G11: Infill

Permission for housing development within the Gilmorton Limits to Development, as defined on the Policies Map, will be supported if the development:

A. Is in keeping with the scale, form and character of its surroundings;

B. Uses traditional materials typical of the local area;

C. Protects important features such as traditional walls, hedgerows and trees;

D. Does not significantly adversely affect the amenities of residents in the area, including daylight/sunlight, privacy, air quality, noise and light pollution; and

E. Has safe and suitable access to the site for all people.

Outside the Gilmorton Limits to Development, permission for housing development will be limited to:

- A. The re-use and adaptation of redundant rural buildings;
- B. Replacement dwellings; and
- C. Rural worker accommodation.

### Policy G12: Construction Method Statements

Other than for minor development, prior to the commencement of development a Construction Method Statement shall be prepared in liaison with Gilmorton Parish Council that addresses:

A. The timing/schedule of works;

B. Details of hours of working;

- C. Parking areas for the vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- D. Areas for the loading and unloading of plant and materials

E. Areas for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;

F. Details of the erection and maintenance of security hoarding;

G. Provision of wheel washing facilities;

H. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;

I. A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition

and construction works;

J. Access and haul routes for construction vehicles, deliveries, waste vehicles, etc. Routes should not pass through Gilmorton village centre.

### Policy G13: Housing Mix

New housing development shall provide for a mix of housing types that will be informed by the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment and local evidence of housing need. Applicants will need to demonstrate how the housing needs of older households and the need for smaller homes will be met.

#### Policy G14: Affordable Housing

The need for affordable housing will be met by existing commitments. On windfall housing developments of 11 dwellings or more, the minimum affordable housing provision is 40%.

All affordable housing will be subject to conditions, or a planning obligation will be sought, to ensure that when homes are allocated, priority is given to people with a local connection to Gilmorton Parish (i.e. including living, working or with close family ties in the Parish).

#### Policy G15: Transport

New development that would generate additional traffic in Gilmorton village will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the following transport conditions will not be made worse:

A. Traffic and parking at drop-off and pick-up times at Gilmorton Chandler Church of England Primary School;

B. On-street parking near the Crown Inn and Village Stores on Main Street, The Crown and Grey Goose public house/restaurants; and C. Speeding traffic within the village.

### Policy G16: Car Parking and New Development

At least two off-street car parking spaces shall be provided for each new dwelling. At least three such spaces should be provided for four-bedroom or larger dwellings.

1.7 The legislation set out below outlines the regulations that require the need for this screening exercise. Section 4 provides a screening assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the Neighbourhood Plan and the need for a full SEA.

#### 2. Legislative Background

- 2.1 The basis for Strategic Environmental Assessments and Sustainability Appraisal legislation is <u>European Directive 2001/42/EC</u> and was transposed into English law by the <u>Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004</u>, or SEA Regulations. Detailed Guidance of these regulations can be found in the Government publication <u>'A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive'</u> (ODPM 2005).
- 2.2 Schedule 2 of the <u>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012</u> makes provision in relation to the Habitats Directive. The Directive requires that any plan or project, likely to have a significant effect on a European site, must be subject to an appropriate assessment. To achieve this, paragraph 1 prescribes a basic condition that the making of a neighbourhood plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site. Paragraphs 2 to 5 of the Schedule amend the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 so as to apply its provisions to neighbourhood development orders and neighbourhood plans. In particular paragraph 4 inserts new regulation 78A which provides that a neighbourhood development order may not grant planning permission for development which is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European site.
- 2.3 Schedule 3 of the <u>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012</u> makes provision in relation to the <u>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive</u>. The Directive requires that EIA development must be subject to a development consent process. To enable this, Schedule 3 prescribes a basic condition that applies where development which is the subject of a proposal for a neighbourhood development order is of a type caught by the EIA Directive, and applies the relevant provisions of the <u>Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)</u> Regulations 2011(3) ("the EIA Regulations") with appropriate modifications (<u>regulation 33</u> and paragraphs <u>1 to 4 and 6 of Schedule 3</u>). Paragraphs 5 and 7 to 13 of Schedule 3 correct errors in the EIA Regulations.
- 2.4 Planning Practice Guidance states the legislation that may be of particular relevance to neighbourhood planning is:
  - the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended)
  - the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)
  - the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended))
- 2.5 It may be appropriate, and in some cases a requirement, that the statutory environmental bodies Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural

England be consulted. For example, a draft neighbourhood plan proposal must be assessed to determine whether it is likely to have significant environmental effects.

- 2.6 There is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal as set out in section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. However, a qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan or order will contribute to achieving sustainable development.
- 2.7 This report focuses on screening for SEA and the criteria for establishing whether a full assessment is needed in light of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy in 2010. A copy of the SA Report can be viewed here; <u>Harborough District Council Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</u>.
- 3. Criteria for Assessing the Effects of Neighbourhood Plans (the 'plan')
- 3.1 Criteria for determining the likely significance of effects referred to in Article 3(5) of Directive 2001/42/EC are set out below:

1. The characteristics of neighbourhood plans ("plan"), having regard, in particular, to

- the degree to which the plan sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources,

- the degree to which the plan influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy,

- the relevance of the plan for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development,

- environmental problems relevant to the plan,

- the relevance of the plan for the implementation of community legislation on the environment (e.g. plans and programmes linked to waste-management or water protection).

2. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to

- the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects,

- the cumulative nature of the effects,

- the trans boundary nature of the effects,

- the risks to human health or the environment (e.g. due to accidents),

- the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected),

- the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to:
- special natural characteristics or cultural heritage,
- exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values,
- intensive land-use,

- the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, Community or international protection status.

Source: Annex II of SEA Directive 2001/42/EC

## 4. Assessment 4.1 Black arrows indicate the process route for Is an Strategic Environmental Assessment needed? This diagram is intended as a guide to the criteria for application of the the Gilmorton Neighbourhood L Is the PP subject to preparation and/or adoption by a national, regional or local authority OR prepared by an authority for adoption through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government? (Art. 2(a)) Plan SEA no to both criteria Screening Assessment. 3. Is the PP prepared for agriculture, forestry, fisheries, energy, industry, transport, waste management, water management, telecommunications, tourism, town and country planning or land use, AND does it set a framework for future development consent of projects in Annexes I and II to the EIA Directive? (Art. 3.Z(a)) no to 4. Will the PP, in view of its likely effect on sites, require an assessment une Article 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive? (Art. 3.2(b)) Does the PP determine the use of small areas at local level, or is it a minor modification of a PF subject to Art. 3.2? (Art. 3.3) 6. Does the PP set the framework for future development consent of projects (no just projects in Annexes to the EIA Directive)? (Art. 3.4) no either no to both criteria . Is the PP's sole purpose to serve national defence or civil emergency, or is it a financial or Idget PP, or is it co-financed by structural funds or EAGGF programmes 2000 to 2006/7? (Ar no to all criteria any

4.2 The table below shows the assessment of whether the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) will require a full SEA. The questions below are drawn from the diagram above which sets out how the SEA Directive should be applied.

| Stage  | Y/N | Reason   |
|--|-----|--|
| 1. Is the NP subject to preparation and/or adoption<br>by a national, regional or local authority OR<br>prepared by an authority for adoption through a<br>legislative procedure by Parliament or<br>Government? (Art. 2(a))   | Y   | The preparation of and adoption of Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan is allowed under The<br>Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.The NP has<br>been prepared by Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan Steering group and submitted by<br>Gilmorton Parish Council (as the 'relevant body') and will be 'made' by HDC as the local<br>authority. The preparation of NPs is subject to the following regulations:<br>The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, The Neighbourhood Planning<br>(General) and Development Management Procedure (Amendment) Regulations 2016 and<br>The Neighbourhood Planning (referendums) Regulations 2012. |
| 2. Is the NP required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions? (Art. 2(a))   | Y   | Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan is not a requirement and is optional under the provisions of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Localism Act 2011, it will if 'made', form part of the Development Plan for the District. It is therefore important that the screening process considers whether it is likely to have significant effects on the natural or historic environment and hence whether SEA is required under the Directive.  |
| 3. Is the NP prepared for agriculture, forestry,<br>fisheries, energy, industry, transport, waste<br>management, water management,<br>telecommunications, tourism, town and country<br>planning or land use, <b>AND</b> does it set a framework<br>for future development consent of projects in<br>Annexes I and II (see Appendix 2) to the EIA<br>Directive? ( <u>Art 3.2(a)</u> ) | N   | Whilst the NP covers a wide range of land use issues and allocations, it does not set the framework for future development consent of projects in Annexes I and II to the EIA Directive (see Appendix 2 for list).   |
| 4. Will the NP, in view of its likely effect on sites, require an assessment for future development under Article 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive? (Art. 3.2 (b))   | N   | Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the Natura 2000 network of protected sites. A full Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report was carried out as part of the Core Strategy preparation process in 2011 and an updated Habitat Regulation Assessment has been undertaken as part of the Local Plan preparation. The report concludes that the Harborough Core Strategy and subsequently the Local Plan , alone or in combination with other plans, are unlikely to have an adverse impact on any of the <i>Natura 2000</i> sites within approximately 25kms of the boundary of the district.                                  |

|   |   | Of the 3 Natura 2000 sites looked at in the Screening Report, Ensor's Pool SAC is<br>approximately 20 Km of the Neighbourhood Development Area of Gilmorton. Ensor's Pool<br>was found to be essentially a self contained eco system. The Habitat Regulations<br>Assessment concluded that its vulnerabilities are very local in nature and unlikely to be<br>caused harm by the Harborough Core Strategy. This conclusion can be assumed<br>applicable for Gilmorton Neighbourhood Development Plan.<br>The <u>River Mease SAC</u> and <u>Rutland Water SPA</u> were also considered in the Habitat<br>Regulations Assessment Screening Report. They lie approx. 35km and 50km respectively<br>from Gilmorton.<br>The Screening Report concluded that the Core Strategy would not lead to significant<br>adverse effects on either area given that:<br>• the River Mease SAC is separate to any water courses in the district and does not<br>contribute to the water supply or drainage of the district; and<br>• any effects on Rutland Water SPA would be indirect and relate only to a greater<br>number of visitors being attracted to the site from additional development in the District.<br>It is considered that the NP will not affect the 3 specified Natura 2000 sites over and above<br>the impacts identified in the Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report carried out<br>for the Core Strategy in 2011 nor for the Local Plan in 2017. Therefore, it is concluded that<br>a full Appropriate Assessment is not deemed to be required.<br>The full Habitat Regulation Assessment Screening Report for the Core Strategy can be<br>viewed at:<br><u>Habitat Regulations Screening Report</u><br>The Local Plan HRA screening report can be found at:<br><u>Habitat Regulations Screening - Report to Harborough Local Plan 2017 8 10</u> |
|---|---|---|
| E. Doop the ND determine the use of erroll error  | Y |   |
| 5. Does the NP determine the use of small areas at local level, OR is it a minor modification of a PP subject to <u>Art. 3.2</u> ? (Art. 3.3) |   | Determination of small sites at local level. The GNP does not seek to allocate sites for housing development there being sufficient housing provision from existing commitments.  |
| 6. Does the NP set the framework for future development consent of projects (not just projects in annexes to the EIA Directive)? (Art 3.4)    | Y | The NP is to be used for determining future planning applications   |

| 7. Is the NP's sole purpose to serve the national defence or civil emergency, OR is it a financial or budget PP, OR is it co-financed by structural funds or EAGGF programmes 2000 to 2006/7? (Art 3.8, 3.9) | N | No further comments   |
|--|---|---|
| 8. Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment? (Art. 3.5)  | N | <ul> <li>Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan is a self contained plan and considers policies only at a local level to ensure development meets the needs of the community. It does not seek to allocate housing development sites as part of the Plan.</li> <li>The Neighbourhood Area does not have any sites of special scientific interest, but it does contain six Local Wildlife Site or potential Local Wildlife Sites. Policy G5 of the GNP seeks to protect local ecology and biodiversity assets.</li> <li>Policy G8 seeks to protect 6 Local Green Spaces that have been identified as having special significance to the community.</li> <li>Policy G9 considers local heritage assets, and seeks to protect these from any harmful effects of development.</li> <li>Localised surface water flooding has not been highlighted as an issue in the Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan. Although some surface water flooding has been identified in the village through the <u>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2017</u> the increased risk of flooding from development will be assessed through the planning process.</li> <li>The Neighbourhood Area excludes the Bruntingthorpe Proving Ground. The LPA recognises that there is some existing noise pollution from the BPG, but this is not a consideration for the GNP.</li> <li>As Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to allocate sites for housing development it is not possible as part of this assessment to consider the detrimental effect. This will, however be determined as part of the planning process. It is considered that other policies to protect the historic and natural environment will have a positive effect on the environment. A full SEA is therefore not required.</li> <li>While the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan recognises the minor negative impact of moderate to high level growth (Scenario 1 – 70 dwellings) on the natural and built</li> </ul> |

| heritage, and the natural environment this scenario is not a policy or consideration of Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan. Other positive benefits have been identified as part of the |
|---|
| sustainability appraisal for the Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan.  |

These questions are answered using the flow diagram in 4.1 above. The result is given by following the logical steps shown by the black arrows on the flow diagram. Note: some of the questions may not be applicable depending on previous answers.

### 5. Sustainability Appraisal and SEA for New Local Plan

- 5.1 A number of scenarios for housing growth have been tested in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for the New Local Plan. The detailed outcome for Gilmorton is shown in **Appendix 3** below.
- 5.2 The scenarios tested and summary of the outcomes for Gilmorton is shown in the table below.

### Gilmorton

### Scenarios tested for Gilmorton

The table below sets out two distinct growth scenarios for Gilmorton to assess the implications of the four selected 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.

| Scen<br>ario | Range of<br>housing growth                           | Relevant<br>Housing                      | Local Employment provision* |           |           | vision* |                | Assumptions  |
|--------------|--|--|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|----------------|--|
|              |  | options                                  | Market<br>Harborough        | Luteworth | Kibwath   | Redney  | Total          |  |
| 1            | Moderate-high growth<br>(70 dwellings)               | A:Core<br>Strategy                       | 10 ha                       | 4 ha      | -         | 3 ha    | 17 ha          | It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job<br>opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Gilmorton.<br>Provision differs from either 4ha to 10ha for Option D. Higher   |
| 2a           | Moderate growth<br>(56-57 dwellings)                 | B: Scraptoft<br>SDA<br>C:Kibworth<br>SDA | 10 ha                       | 4 ha      | -<br>5 ha | 3 ha    | 17 ha<br>22 ha | provision differs from either and to roha for Option D. Aigher<br>provision of employment land in Lutterworth ought to be more<br>beneficial for residents in Gilmorton in terms of access to jobs.<br>Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of<br>housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in<br>Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). |
| 2ь           | Moderate growth<br>(56 dwellings)<br>SDA Lutterworth | D:<br>Lutterworth<br>East SDA            |                             | 10 ha     | -         |         | 23 ha          | Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be<br>beneficial to residents in Gilmorton as public transport links are poor<br>between these settlements, and links to Leicester are stronger.  |

#### Summary of effects for Gilmorton

|   | 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)    | ~                      | ~           | √√/ <u>?</u> |
| Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6) | -                      | -           | -            |
| Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)     | $\checkmark\checkmark$ | ~           | ~~           |
| Resource Use (SA Objective 9)                   | ×                      | ×           | ×            |

5.3 All scenarios (moderate and moderate to high growth) are showing a minor negative impact on Natural Environment and Built and Natural Environment. The remainder of the scenarios show a minor positive or neutral impact on the settlement except for Resource Use.

5.4 Gilmorton NDP does not propose to allocate sites for housing. The NDP supports windfall development in Gilmorton through policy G11: Infill. The Plan supports development if the it is in keeping with the scale, form and character of its surroundings; uses traditional materials typical of the local area; protects important features such as traditional walls, hedgerows and trees; does not significantly adversely affect the amenities of residents in the area, including daylight/sunlight, privacy, air quality, noise and light pollution; and has safe and suitable access to the site for all people

### 6. Screening Outcome of May 2018

- 6.1 As a result of the assessment in Section 4 above it is unlikely there will be any significant environmental effects arising from policies in Gilmorton Pre - Submission version Neighbourhood Plan as submitted at the date of this assessment, that were not covered in the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal for the emerging New Local Plan. <u>As such, it is the consideration of the Local Planning</u> <u>Authority that Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan does not require a full SEA to be undertaken.</u>
- 6.2 The Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England will be consulted on this Screening Report and their responses will be made available through Gilmorton Neighbourhood Plan Evidence base.
- 6.3 If the issues addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan should change then a new screening process will need to be undertaken determine whether an SEA will be required. Please contact Harborough District Council for advice in this circumstance.

## Appendix 1

### CONSERVATION AREA AND LISTED BUILDINGS WITHIN THE PARISH OF GILMORTON

| Other Settlement    | Occurrence  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| features:           |   |  |  |  |
| Conservation Area   | Gilmorton does not have a Conservation Area         |  |  |  |
|                     |   |  |  |  |
| Scheduled Monuments | Motte, moat and fishponds west of All Saints Church |  |  |  |
|                     | Motte, moat and fishponds west of All Saints Church |  |  |  |
|                     | List Entry Number: 1010495                          |  |  |  |
|                     | Heritage Category: Scheduling                       |  |  |  |
|                     | Location: Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire     |  |  |  |
|                     |   |  |  |  |
|                     | Location and Grade                                  |  |  |  |
| Listed buildings    | GILMORTON MILL                                      |  |  |  |
| 80                  | List Entry Number: 1209161                          |  |  |  |
|                     | Heritage Category: Listing                          |  |  |  |
|                     | Grade: II   |  |  |  |

|          | Location: GILMORTON MILL, MILL LANE, Gilmorton, Harborough, |
|----------|---|
|          | Leicestershire  |
| <u> </u> | Moated site at Cotes de Val, Gilmorton                      |
|          | List Entry Number: 1010194                                  |
|          | Heritage Category: Scheduling                               |
|          | Location: Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire             |
| <u> </u> | GILMORTON FARMHOUSE AND BARN TO SOUTH                       |
|          | List Entry Number: 1217865                                  |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing                                  |
|          | Grade: II   |
|          | Location: GILMORTON FARMHOUSE AND BARN TO SOUTH,            |
|          | LUTTERWORTH ROAD, Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire     |
| <u> </u> | BARN AND STABLE 30 YARDS SOUTH WEST OF GILMORTON FARMHOUSE  |
|          | List Entry Number: 1209158                                  |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing                                  |
|          | • Grade: II   |
|          | Location: BARN AND STABLE 30 YARDS SOUTH WEST OF GILMORTON  |
|          | FARMHOUSE, LUTTERWORTH ROAD, Gilmorton, Harborough,         |
|          | Leicestershire  |
| 9        | STRETCH OF BRICK WALLING TO SOUTH SIDE OF CHURCH DRIVE      |
|          | List Entry Number: 1209156                                  |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing                                  |
|          | • Grade: II   |
|          | Location: STRETCH OF BRICK WALLING TO SOUTH SIDE OF CHURCH  |
|          | DRIVE, CHURCH DRIVE, Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire  |
| 1        | WAGON SHED TO EAST OF CHURCH                                |
|          | List Entry Number: 1209157                                  |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing                                  |
|          | Grade: II   |
|          | Location: WAGON SHED TO EAST OF CHURCH, CHURCH DRIVE,       |
|          | Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire                       |
| ]        | THATCH COTTAGE  |
|          | List Entry Number: 1292193                                  |

|          | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|----------|--|
|          | Grade: II  |
|          | Location: THATCH COTTAGE, MILL LANE, Gilmorton, Harborough,            |
|          | Leicestershire   |
| ]        | THE OLD HOMESTEAD  |
|          | List Entry Number: 1292227   |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|          | Grade: II  |
|          | • Location: THE OLD HOMESTEAD, LUTTERWORTH ROAD, Gilmorton,            |
|          | Harborough, Leicestershire   |
| <u> </u> | FORMER STABLE WING TO NORTH OF OLD HOMESTEAD                           |
|          | List Entry Number: 1217878   |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|          | Grade: II  |
|          | • Location: FORMER STABLE WING TO NORTH OF OLD HOMESTEAD,              |
|          | LUTTERWORTH ROAD, Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire                |
| <u> </u> | WHITE HOUSE FARMHOUSE  |
|          | List Entry Number: 1209159   |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|          | Grade: II  |
|          | <ul> <li>Location: WHITE HOUSE FARMHOUSE, LUTTERWORTH ROAD,</li> </ul> |
|          | Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire                                  |
| ]        | TANSLEYS THATCH WHEELWRIGHTS COTTAGE                                   |
|          | List Entry Number: 1209160   |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|          | Grade: II  |
|          | Location: TANSLEYS THATCH, MAIN STREET, Gilmorton, Harborough,         |
|          | Leicestershire   |
|          | DCTOBER COTTAGE  |
|          | List Entry Number: 1292210   |
|          | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|          | Grade: II  |
|          | Location: OCTOBER COTTAGE, MAIN STREET, Gilmorton, Harborough,         |

| F |  |
|---|--|
|   | Leicestershire   |
|   | THE RED LION   |
|   | List Entry Number: 1292768   |
|   | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|   | • Grade: II  |
|   | <ul> <li>Location: THE RED LION, MAIN STREET, Gilmorton, Harborough,</li> </ul>  |
|   | Leicestershire   |
|   | CLAY WALLS   |
|   | List Entry Number: 1292804   |
|   | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|   | • Grade: II  |
|   | <ul> <li>Location: CLAY WALLS, ASHBY ROAD, Gilmorton, Harborough,</li> </ul>     |
|   | Leicestershire   |
|   | HOUSE TO EAST OF HOME FARM HOUSE   |
|   | List Entry Number: 1292807   |
|   | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|   | • Grade: II  |
|   | Location: HOUSE TO EAST OF HOME FARM HOUSE, MAIN STREET,                         |
|   | Gilmorton, Harborough, Leicestershire  |
|   | HOME FARM HOUSE  |
|   | List Entry Number: 1217900   |
|   | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|   | Grade: II  |
|   | <ul> <li>Location: HOME FARM HOUSE, MAIN STREET, Gilmorton,</li> </ul>           |
|   | Harborough, Leicestershire   |
|   | TUDOR COTTAGE  |
|   | List Entry Number: 1217967   |
|   | Heritage Category: Listing   |
|   | Grade: II  |
|   | <ul> <li>Location: TUDOR COTTAGE, MAIN STREET, Gilmorton, Harborough,</li> </ul> |
|   | Leicestershire   |
|   | THE OLD COTTAGE  |
|   | List Entry Number: 1292806   |

| Heritage Category: Listing   |
|--|
| Grade: II  |
| <ul> <li>Location: THE OLD COTTAGE, LUTTERWORTH ROAD, Gilmorton,<br/>Harborough, Leicestershire</li> </ul> |
| THE GATEHOUSE  |
| List Entry Number: 1217945   |
| Heritage Category: Listing   |
| Grade: II  |
| <ul> <li>Location: THE GATEHOUSE, MAIN STREET, Gilmorton, Harborough,</li> </ul>                           |
| Leicestershire   |
| CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS   |
| List Entry Number: 1292805   |
| Heritage Category: Listing   |
| Grade: II*   |
| Location: CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS, CHURCH DRIVE, Gilmorton,   |
| Harborough, Leicestershire   |
| •  |
|  |
|  |

### Appendix 2

### Annex I

- 1. Crude-oil refineries (excluding undertakings manufacturing only lubricants from crude oil) and installations for the gasification and liquefaction of 500 tonnes or more of coal or bituminous shale per day.
- 2. Thermal power stations and other combustion installations with a heat output of 300 megawatts or more and nuclear power stations and other nuclear reactors (except research installations for the production and conversion of fissionable and fertile materials, whose maximum power does not exceed 1 kilowatt continuous thermal load).
- 3. Installations solely designed for the permanent storage or final disposal of radioactive waste.
- 4. Integrated works for the initial melting of cast-iron and steel.
- 5. Installations for the extraction of asbestos and for the processing and transformation of asbestos and products containing asbestos: for asbestos-cement products, with an annual production of more than 20 000 tonnes of finished products, for friction material, with an annual production of more than 50 tonnes of finished products, and for other uses of asbestos, utilization of more than 200 tonnes per year.
- 6. Integrated chemical installations.
- 7. Construction of motorways, express roads (1) and lines for long-distance railway traffic and of airports (2) with a basic runway length of 2 100 m or more.
- 8. Trading ports and also inland waterways and ports for inland-waterway traffic which permit the passage of vessels of over 1 350 tonnes.
- 9. Waste-disposal installations for the incineration, chemical treatment or land fill of toxic and dangerous wastes.

(1) For the purposes of the Directive, 'express road' means a road which complies with the definition in the European Agreement on main international traffic arteries of 15 November 1975.

(2) For the purposes of this Directive, 'airport' means airports which comply with the definition in the 1944 Chicago Convention setting up the International Civil Aviation Organization (Annex 14).

### Annex II

### 1. Agriculture

(a) Projects for the restructuring of rural land holdings.

(b) Projects for the use of uncultivated land or semi-natural areas for intensive agricultural purposes.

(c) Water-management projects for agriculture.

(d) Initial afforestation where this may lead to adverse ecological changes and land reclamation for the purposes of conversion to another type of land use.

(e) Poultry-rearing installations.

(f) Pig-rearing installations.

(g) Salmon breeding.

(h) Reclamation of land from the sea.

### 2. Extractive industry

(a) Extraction of peat.

(b) Deep drillings with the exception of drillings for investigating the stability of the soil and in particular:

- geothermal drilling,
- drilling for the storage of nuclear waste material,
- drilling for water supplies.

(c) Extraction of minerals other than metalliferous and energy-producing minerals, such as marble, sand, gravel, shale, salt, phosphates and potash.

(d) Extraction of coal and lignite by underground mining. (e) Extraction of coal and lignite by open-cast mining. (f) Extraction of petroleum.

(g) Extraction of natural gas.

(h) Extraction of ores.

(i) Extraction of bituminous shale.

(j) Extraction of minerals other than metalliferous and energy-producing minerals by open-cast mining.

(k) Surface industrial installations for the extraction of coal, petroleum, natural gas and ores, as well as bituminous shale.

(I) Coke ovens (dry coal distillation).

(m) Installations for the manufacture of cement.

- 3. Energy industry
- (a) Industrial installations for the production of electricity, steam and hot water (unless included in Annex I).
- (b) Industrial installations for carrying gas, steam and hot water; transmission of electrical energy by overhead cables.
- (c) Surface storage of natural gas.
- (d) Underground storage of combustible gases.
- (e) Surface storage of fossil fuels.
- (f) Industrial briquetting of coal and lignite.
- (g) Installations for the production or enrichment of nuclear fuels.
- (h) Installations for the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear fuels.
- (i) Installations for the collection and processing of radioactive waste (unless included in Annex I).
- (j) Installations for hydroelectric energy production.
- 4. Processing of metals
- (a) Iron and steelworks, including foundries, forges, drawing plants and rolling mills (unless included in Annex I).
- (b) Installations for the production, including smelting, refining, drawing and rolling, of nonferrous metals, excluding precious metals.
- (c) Pressing, drawing and stamping of large castings.
- (d) Surface treatment and coating of metals.
- (e) Boilermaking, manufacture of reservoirs, tanks and other sheet-metal containers.
- (f) Manufacture and assembly of motor vehicles and manufacture of motor-vehicle engines.
- (g) Shipyards.
- (h) Installations for the construction and repair of aircraft.

(i) Manufacture of railway equipment.

(j) Swaging by explosives.

(k) Installations for the roasting and sintering of metallic ores.

### 5. Manufacture of glass

7. Chemical industry

(a) Treatment of intermediate products and production of chemicals (unless included in Annex I).

(b) Production of pesticides and pharmaceutical products, paint and varnishes, elastomers and peroxides.

(c) Storage facilities for petroleum, petrochemical and chemical products.

### 8. Food industry

- (a) Manufacture of vegetable and animal oils and fats.
- (b) Packing and canning of animal and vegetable products.
- (c) Manufacture of dairy products.
- (d) Brewing and malting.
- (e) Confectionery and syrup manufacture.
- (f) Installations for the slaughter of animals.
- (g) Industrial starch manufacturing installations.
- (h) Fish-meal and fish-oil factories.

(i) Sugar factories.

- 9. Textile, leather, wood and paper industries
- (a) Wool scouring, degreasing and bleaching factories.
- (b) Manufacture of fibre board, particle board and plywood.
- (c) Manufacture of pulp, paper and board.
- (d) Fibre-dyeing factories.

(e) Cellulose-processing and production installations.

- (f) Tannery and leather-dressing factories.
- 10. Rubber industry

Manufacture and treatment of elastomer-based products.

- 11. Infrastructure projects
- (a) Industrial-estate development projects.
- (b) Urban-development projects.
- (c) Ski-lifts and cable-cars.
- (d) Construction of roads, harbours, including fishing harbours, and airfields (projects not listed in Annex I).
- (e) Canalization and flood-relief works.
- (f) Dams and other installations designed to hold water or store it on a long-term basis.

(g) Tramways, elevated and underground railways, suspended lines or similar lines of a particular type, used exclusively or mainly for passenger transport.

- (h) Oil and gas pipeline installations.
- (i) Installation of long-distance aqueducts.
- (j) Yacht marinas.
- 12. Other projects
- (a) Holiday villages, hotel complexes.
- (b) Permanent racing and test tracks for cars and motor cycles.
- (c) Installations for the disposal of industrial and domestic waste (unless included in Annex I).
- (d) Waste water treatment plants.
- (e) Sludge-deposition sites.
- (f) Storage of scrap iron.
- (g) Test benches for engines, turbines or reactors.

(h) Manufacture of artificial mineral fibres.

(i) Manufacture, packing, loading or placing in cartridges of gunpowder and explosives.

(j) Knackers' yards.

13. Modifications to development projects included in Annex I and projects in Annex II undertaken exclusively or mainly for the development and testing of new methods or products and not used for more than one year

### Appendix 3

### Sustainability Appraisal for Gilmorton within the New Local Plan SA and SEA

The reasonable alternatives against which the housing growth for Gilmorton has been assessed are shown below.

Table 2.2: Strategic options for housing and employment (i.e. the reasonable alternatives tested in the SA)

| Option  | Description   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Option 1: Rural</b><br>Continue the current<br>distribution strategy with a<br>rural focus)        | 60% of the District's future housing need would be met in the urban settlements (Thurnby, Bushby and Scraptoft, Market Harborough, Lutterworth and Broughton Astley) and 40% met in the rural settlements (Rural Centres and Selected Rural Villages). The bulk of employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha), with at least 4ha at Lutterworth and approximately 3ha at Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. |  |
| Option 2: Core Strategy<br>Distribution<br>Continue to use the Core<br>Strategy distribution strategy | Distribution of future housing need would continue as identified in the Core Strategy with approximately 70% of future new housing planned for the urban settlements and 30% planned for the rural settlements. The bulk of employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha) with at least 4ha at Lutterworth and approximately 3ha at Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth.   |  |
| <b>Option 3: Urban</b><br>Continue the current<br>distribution strategy with an<br>urban focus        | 80% of the District's future housing need would be met in the urban settlements and 20% met in the rural settlements. The bulk of employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha) with at least 4ha at Lutterworth and approximately 3ha at Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth.   |  |

| Option  | Description   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Option 4: Scraptoft /<br>Thurnby SDA<br>Scraptoft / Thurnby Strategic<br>Development Area and<br>reduced growth in other parts<br>of the District | A proposal which would provide a significant extension to the east of Scraptoft and Thurnby has been received by the Council. The proposal is for at least 1000 dwellings with community facilities together with a link-road between Scraptoft village and the A47. Further assessment of transport impacts, landscape and viability is needed. However, delivery of this strategic development area would reduce the requirement for all other settlements in the District. The bulk of employment provision would be in Market Harborough (approximately 10ha) with at least 4ha at Lutterworth and approximately 3ha at Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. The potential SDA at Scraptoft does not include proposals to deliver employment land.   |  |  |
| <b>Option 5: Kibworth SDA</b><br>Kibworth Strategic<br>Development Area and<br>reduced growth in other parts<br>of the District                   | Two proposals near have been received. Both proposals offer new road infrastructure, community and employment facilities and around 1,200 houses. One proposal involves development to the north of Kibworth Harcourt and a potential relief road for the existing A6. The other involves development to the west of and linking road infrastructure between the A6 and Saddington Road. Further assessment of transport impacts, landscape and viability is needed in terms of both proposals. <u>This Option would include just one of these two strategic development areas</u> . Delivery of either potential strategic development area would reduce the requirement for all other settlements in the District. Approximately 5ha of employment land would be delivered as part of the Kibworth SDA. A further approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered in Market Harborough along with at least 4ha at Lutterworth and approximately 3ha at Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. |  |  |

| Option 6: Lutterworth SDA   | A proposal which could result in development of approximately 1,950 dwellings, local facilities and employment land<br>by 2031 to the east of Lutterworth has been received by the Council. This would involve provision of a road link<br>between the A4304 (to the east of Lutterworth) and A426 (Leicester Road to the north of Lutterworth) thus providing<br>relief for Lutterworth town centre. It would lead to approximately 550 dwellings delivered in this location after 2031. |
|---|---|
| Lutterworth Strategic<br>Development Area and<br>reduced growth in other parts<br>of the District | There is also scope for provision of a motorway service facility adjoining M1 Junction 20 and land for logistics and distribution. Further assessment of transport impacts, landscape and viability is needed. Delivery of this strategic development area would reduce the requirement for all other settlements in the District.  |
|   | Approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered at Lutterworth in conjunction with delivery of the Lutterworth SDA. A further approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered in Market Harborough along with approximately 3ha at Fleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth.  |

| Option   | Description  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| Option 7: Scraptoft /<br>Thurnby SDA and Kibworth<br>SDA   | This would involve two strategic development areas in the District: approximately 1,200 dwellings at ; and approximately 1,000 dwellings to the east of Scraptoft / Thurnby. Further housing in each of the proposed strategic development areas may take place beyond 2031. Other settlements would receive limited housing growth.   |  |  |
| Strategic Development Areas<br>at Scraptoft / Thurnby and<br>Kibworth and limited growth in<br>other part of the District  | potential Kibworth SDAs. A further approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered in Market  |  |  |
| Option 8 Scraptoft / Thurnby<br>SDA and Lutterworth SDA<br>Strategic Development Areas<br>at Scraptoft / Thurnby and<br>Lutterworth and limited growth<br>in other part of the District) | This would involve two strategic development areas in the District: approximately 1,950 dwellings to the east of Lutterworth; and approximately 1,000 dwellings to the east of Scraptoft / Thurnby. Further housing in each of the proposed strategic development areas may take place beyond 2031. Other settlements would receive limited housing growth.<br>Approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered at Lutterworth in conjunction with delivery of the Lutterworth SDA. A further approximately 10ha of employment land af Eleckney to balance its relatively high potential housing growth. |  |  |



| Option 9: Lutterworth SDA and Kibworth SDA   | This would involve two strategic development areas in the District: approximately 1,950 dwellings to the east of Lutterworth; and approximately 1,200 dwellings at . Further housing in each of the proposed strategic development areas may take place beyond 2031. Other settlements would receive limited housing growth.   |
|--|--|
| Strategic Development Areas<br>at Lutterworth and Kibworth<br>and limited growth in other<br>part of the District) | Approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered at Lutterworth in conjunction with delivery of the Lutterworth SDA. Approximately 5ha of employment land would be delivered at Kibworth in conjunction with one of the potential Kibworth SDAs. A further approximately 10ha of employment land would be delivered in Market Harborough and approximately 3ha of employment land at Fleckney to balance its potential housing growth. |

### Each of the above housing options has been tested against the following sustainability topics.

| Sustainability<br>Topic | SA Objectives   | Guiding Criteria  | Potential Monitoring Indicators  |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| Natural<br>Environment  | <ol> <li>Protect, enhance and<br/>manage biodiversity.</li> <li>Protect, enhance and<br/>manage<br/>environmental<br/>resources.</li> </ol> | <ul><li>1.1) Would biodiversity interests be affected?</li><li>2.1) What could be the effects on the quality of water environments?</li><li>2.2) What could be the effects on land quality?</li></ul> | <ul> <li>Net effect on number and area of Local Wildlife Sites.</li> <li>Impact on Water Framework Development compliance</li> </ul> |
| Built and natural<br>heritage | 3) Protect, enhance and<br>manage the historic<br>character and<br>distinctiveness of the<br>District's settlements<br>and their surrounding<br>landscapes. | <ul> <li>3.1) How could proposals affect<br/>the historic value and character<br/>of settlements and/or<br/>surrounding landscapes?</li> <li>3.2) Could proposals hinder or<br/>assist efforts to maintain and<br/>enhance features (designated<br/>and non-designated) of historic,<br/>cultural or archaeological<br/>interest?</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Number of heritage features 'at risk'.</li> <li>Development granted contrary to heritage policies.</li> <li>Percentage of people that think the character of their neighbourhood has improved / stayed the same / declined.</li> </ul> |
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
|-------------------------------|---|--|---|

| Sustainability<br>Topic | SA Objectives    | Guiding Criteria   | Potential Monitoring Indicators  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|                         | 4) Safeguard and | <ul> <li>4.1) How could proposals affect standards of open space, recreation and leisure provision?</li> <li>4.2) Could proposals have an effect on efforts to maintain and strengthen local identity and community cohesion?</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Average healthy life expectancy.</li> <li>Participation levels in sport and recreation.</li> <li>Area of green infrastructure provided in conjunction with new housing.</li> <li>Amount of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.</li> <li>Number of properties experiencing pollutant concentrations in excess of the standard.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |

| Health and<br>Wellbeing | <ul> <li>improve community<br/>health, safety and<br/>wellbeing.</li> <li>5) Improve accessibility<br/>to employment, retail,<br/>business, health and<br/>community services,<br/>supporting health and<br/>well-being in the<br/>district.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>4.3) Could proposals have<br/>different impacts on certain<br/>social groups (<i>age, gender,</i><br/><i>social class for example</i>)?</li> <li>4.4) How could proposals<br/>impact upon air quality<br/>(particularly in Lutterworth)?</li> <li>5.1) What impact could there be<br/>on local service provision,<br/>particularly in rural areas?</li> <li>5.2) What modes of transport<br/>would most likely be<br/>encouraged and how would<br/>these affect greenhouse gas<br/>emissions?</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Percentage of completed non – residential development complying with carparking standards.</li> <li>Length of new/improved cycleway and pedestrian routes.</li> </ul> |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|
|-------------------------|---|---|--|

| Sustainability<br>Topic           | SA Objectives  | Guiding Criteria   | Potential Monitoring Indicators   |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Resilience (to<br>climate change) | 6) Reduce the risks<br>from local and global<br>climate change upon<br>economic activity,<br>delivery of essential<br>services and the<br>natural environment. | <ul> <li>6.1) What would be the effect in terms of flood risk?</li> <li>6.2) How would the resilience of local businesses be affected?</li> <li>6.3) How would the proposal affect the delivery of essential services?</li> <li>6.4) What will be the effects on green infrastructure and its ability to contribute to climate change resilience?</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding.</li> <li>Annual local authority expenditure on flood management measures.</li> </ul> |
| Housing and<br>Economy            | <ol> <li>Provide affordable,<br/>sustainable, good-<br/>quality housing for<br/>all.</li> </ol>  | <ul><li>7.1) How could proposals affect<br/>levels of house building?</li><li>7.2) How could proposals affect<br/>the ability to deliver affordable<br/>housing?</li></ul>   | <ul> <li>Net additional dwellings.</li> <li>Gross affordable housing completions.</li> </ul>  |

| Sustainability<br>Topic | SA Objectives  | Guiding Criteria  | Potential Monitoring Indicators   |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|
|                         | 8) Support investment<br>to grow the local<br>economy. | <ul> <li>8.1) Would proposals help to create job opportunities for local residents?</li> <li>8.2) Would the proposals support the rural economy?</li> <li>8.3) Would the proposals help to support the vitality of town centres and their retail offer?</li> <li>8.4) Would the proposals help to secure improvements in telecommunications infrastructure? (<i>For example high speed broadband connectivity</i>)</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Total amount of additional floor space by type.</li> <li>Employment land available.</li> <li>Jobs created / retained in rural areas.</li> <li>Total number of visitors and spend on tourism.</li> <li>Broadband coverage and speed.</li> </ul> |

| Resource use | 9) Use and manage<br>resources efficiently,<br>whilst and minimising<br>Harborough's emissi<br>ons of greenhouse<br>gases. | <ul> <li>9.1) To what extent would proposals lead to an increase or decrease in the use of energy and / or water?</li> <li>9.2) Do proposals help to achieve / support a reduction in carbon emissions?</li> <li>9.3) Do proposals encourage the efficient use of minerals?</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>% of developments achieving a higher CFSH homes water efficiency rating than required by building regulations.</li> <li>Carbon emissions from road transport.</li> </ul> |
|--------------|--|--|---|
|--------------|--|--|---|



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

The scenarios for growth are:

| Scen<br>ario | Range of<br>housing growth                           | Relevant<br>Housing                      |                      | Local Employment provision* |           |        |                | Assumptions  |
|--------------|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|----------------|--|
|              |  | options                                  | Market<br>Harborough | Luteworth                   | Kibwarth  | Redney | Total          |  |
| 1            | Moderate-high growth<br>(70 dwellings)               | A:Core<br>Strategy                       | 10 ha                | 4 ha                        | -         | 3 ha   | 17 ha          | It is possible that employment land in Lutterworth could provide job<br>opportunities that could be easily accessed by residents in Gilmorton.<br>Provision differs from either 4ha to 10ha for Option D. Higher   |
| 2a           | Moderate growth<br>(56-57 dwellings)                 | B: Scraptoft<br>SDA<br>C:Kibworth<br>SDA | 10 ha                | 4 ha                        | -<br>5 ha | 3 ha   | 17 ha<br>22 ha | provision differs from entries and to the provision of employment land in Lutterworth ought to be more<br>beneficial for residents in Gilmorton in terms of access to jobs.<br>Therefore, although Scenarios 2a and 2b have similar levels of<br>housing growth, they differ in terms of employment provision in<br>Lutterworth (and have been separated on this basis). |
| 2b           | Moderate growth<br>(56 dwellings)<br>SDA Lutterworth | D:<br>Lutterworth<br>East SDA            |                      | 10 ha                       | -         |        | 23 ha          | Provision in Kibworth and Fleckney would be less likely to be<br>beneficial to residents in Gilmorton as public transport links are poor<br>between these settlements, and links to Leicester are stronger.  |

#### The SA topics are:

| 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

 $\checkmark$ 

×

?

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

#### Gilmorton

#### Scenarios tested for Gilmorton

The table below sets out two distinct scenarios for Gilmorton to assess the implications of the four refined 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.

SA findings for Gilmorton

| Natural Environr  | nent (SA Objectives 1 and 2)  | Scenario 1 | ×         | Scenario 2a | ×                                | Scenario 2b | × |
|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Nature of<br>effects  | <i>Biodiversity</i> - 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.<br><i>Environmental quality</i> - There is the potential for loss of land classified as Grade 2/3 under Scenario 1, and to a slightly lesser extent scenario 2a/2b. The total loss of land would be lower than 5 hectares even for the highest target under scenario 1. |            |           |             |                                  |             |   |
| Sensitivity of<br>receptors   | <ul> <li>Misteriori Marsnes, However, applications for residential development are not considered likely to have any impact.</li> </ul>   |            |           |             |                                  | or          |   |
| Likelihood of<br>effects It is likely that effects on biodiversity could be avoided through sensitive layout and design.<br>It is very likely that there would be a permanent loss of agricultural land of Grade 2/3 under 5  |   |            | enarios 1 | and 2a/2b.  |                                  |             |   |
| 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 effects on habitats of local importance such as hedges and trees. The effects are only considered to be minor as the surrounding areas a particularly sensitive (and mitigation / enhancement ought to be possible), and the level of growth is not substantial. The effects of Scenario 1, but slightly lower in scale. At this scale of growth there would be slightly more potential to avoid sites that are most Nevertheless, a minor negative effect is predicted. |   |            |           |             | areas are not<br>Scenario 2a /2b | would       |   |

| Built and Natura  | I Heritage (SA Objective 3)   | Scenario 1       | ×            | Scenario 2a          | ×          | Scenario 2b | × |  |  |
|---|---|------------------|--------------|----------------------|------------|-------------|---|--|--|
|   | There would be no different effects for scenarios 2a and 2b as these are only differentiate<br>Therefore references to Scenario 1 below cover both sub-options.   | d on the basis o | f the provis | sion of employment l | and in Lut | terworth.   |   |  |  |
| Nature of<br>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 deve  | elopment.        |              |                      |            |             |   |  |  |
| Sensitivity of<br>receptors   | Gilmorton does not contain a Conservation Area, but there are 20 listed buildings, and 2 known sites of archaeological importance.<br>Located within the Lutterworth Lowlands Landscape Character Area which has medium – high landscape capacity to accommodate development (in<br>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<br>effects  | of Depending upon the location and design of development, there may be an effect on the character of the settlement. However, the relatively modest scale of growth ought to ensure that development in the most sensitive areas can be avoided and / or mitigated. None of the sites identified in the SHLAA (2015) contain designated heritage assets, though development of some could affect their setting.                         |                  |              |                      |            |             |   |  |  |
| 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 the most sensitive areas and mitigate potential impacts as in broad terms the landscap has capacity to accommodate change. Scenario 2 would involve a smaller level of growth but is still predicted to have a minor negative effect on built or natural heritage. |   |                  |              |                      |            |             |   |  |  |

| Health and Wellt            | eing (SA Objectives 4 and 5)   | Scenario 1        | ~        | Scenario 2a           | ~        | Scenario 2b | <b>√√/?</b> |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|--|--|
|                             | Scenarios 1, 2 and 2a would require increased provision of local school and health provision, but this would be difficult to provide locally at higher levels<br>of growth. Both scenarios would have a positive effect in terms of providing affordable housing, and potentially securing enhancements to open space<br>and community infrastructure through developer contributions. The effects would be most positive for Scenario 1 and slightly lesser for Scenario 2.               |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
| Nature of<br>effects        | Scenario 1, would deliver a fairly high rate of housing growth in Gilmorton, which ought to address affordability issues. Scenarios 2a and 2b would also<br>make a contribution to affordable housing in Gilmorton itself, whilst for 2b there would also be provision of housing at Lutterworth East SDA, which might<br>help to improve choice for residents in and around Gilmorton.  |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
|                             | 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<br>substantial enough on its own to have a significant effect though, but may present a potential issue under Scenario 2b which involves substantial growth<br>nearby at an SDA in Lutterworth (Which could possibly affect traffic through Gilmorton).   |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
|                             | Gilmorton has a population of 976 (decrease of 41 or 4% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the district over the same period).   |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
|                             | Gilmorton Parish Council is planning to lead on the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.   |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
| Sensitivity of<br>receptors | 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.<br>S106 contributions towards the provision of additional GP surgery equipment would be sought. There are shortfalls in some types of open space.  |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
| Likelihood of               | For Scenario 1 and to a slightly 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. 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. |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
| effects                     | 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.   |                   |          |                       |          |             |             |  |  |
|                             | Depending upon the location and scale of development, trips to and through t<br>would be likely to occur on the settlement edges.  | he village centre | e by car | r are likely to incre | ease, as | development |             |  |  |

|              | 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. |
|--------------|--|
| Significance | Scenario 2a would have similar effects to Scenario 1. Although the positive effects would be less pronounced, there would also be slightly less pressure<br>on local services and the scale of growth is moderate. Therefore, a minor positive effect is predicted.  |
|              | For Scenario 2b, there would also be alternative opportunities for housing and employment at Lutterworth SDA, which ought to have positive effects upon residents in Gilmorton. Therefore, a moderate positive effect is predicted for 2b.   |
|              | Air quality is unlikely to be affected by growth in Gilmorton, but for Scenario 2b, growth at Lutterworth SDA could possibly affect traffic through Gilmorton, which is recorded as an uncertain negative effect for scenario 2b.  |

| Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6) |  | Scenario 1 | - | Scenario 2a | - | Scenario 2b | - |
|---|--|------------|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| Nature of<br>effects                            | There is potential for development to increase areas of impermeable land, which could contribute to increased surface water run-off.   |            |   |             |   |             |   |
| Sensitivity of<br>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 SHLAA (2015).   |            |   |             |   |             |   |
| Likelihood of<br>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<br>effects                        | Each scenario would support the development of housing growth in Gilmorton, helping to reverse population decline and deliver housing to meet local needs. Scenario 2b 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<br>receptors                 | Between 2001 and 2011 there was a population decrease of 41 or 4% since 2001 compared to an increase of 11.5% across the district over same period.   |            |    |             |     |             |    |
| Likelihood of<br>effects                    | There is sufficient land in the SHLAA (2015) to meet the housing numbers under each scenario.   |            |    |             |     |             |    |
| Significance                                | Scenario 1 should improve housing choice and affordability in Gilmorton and support the vitality of the local village. This would help to reverse population decline and constitutes a moderate positive effect.<br>Scenario 2a would have similar effects to Scenario 1, but at a lesser scale, and thus a minor positive effect is predicted.<br>Scenario 2b would have similar effects to Scenario 2a, 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 2a | × | Scenario 2b | × |
|-------------------------------|---|------------|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| Nature of<br>effects          | Additional development 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<br>receptors   | Gilmorton 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. Gilmorton also has a high proportion of detached homes, which may have higher heating needs (62%, Census 2011).  |            |   |             |   |             |   |
| Likelihood of<br>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 Gilmorton and any new development would be unlikely to change this.<br>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<br>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<br>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<br>greenhouse gas emissions across the district (albeit minor). Consequently a minor negative effect is predicted for Scenario 1 and 2. |            |   |             |   |             |   |

### Summary of effects for Gilmorton

|   | 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)    | ×          | ×           | √√ <i> </i> ? |
| Resilience (to climate change) (SA Objective 6) | -          | -           | -             |
| Housing and Economy (SA Objectives 7 and 8)     | ~~         | ×           | ~~            |
| Resource Use (SA Objective 9)                   | ×          | ×           | ×             |