

## Spatial strategy and site selection methodology summary

The stages of the site selection process and development of reasonable alternative spatial strategy options are set out in the boxes below.

Site selection is an iterative rather than a linear process. Assessments of individual sites and growth scenarios were updated as more evidence and information became available through the plan-making process. This is reflected in the differences between the Regulation 18 “Preferred Options” version of the Stage 2 site assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the final pre-submission versions. The published versions reflect the final outcomes of that process. In particular, the SA and Stage 2 site assessment were produced and updated concurrently rather than sequentially.

| <b>Stage 1a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)</b>   |
|---|
| <b>Role:</b> GIS based analysis of sites to identify showstopper constraints and unsuitable options   |
| <b>Source of sites:</b> call for sites, lapsed planning permissions, allocations, planning permissions, officer identified.   |
| <b>Number of sites considered:</b> 261. An addendum was produced following the Regulation 18 “Preferred Options” consultation adding 11 further sites and updating the analysis for 5 previously assessed sites.  |
| <b>Analysis:</b> GIS, desk-based review of constraints.   |
| <b>Possible outcomes:</b> (1) discounted (2) suitable, achievable and available (3) not currently developable – changes to policy would be required   |
| <b>Reasons for discounting sites:</b> (1) duplicates, (2) not available (3) too small to meet HELAA minimum size threshold (4) extant planning permission (5) outside of borough (6) flood risk where a significant proportion of site is at high risk of flooding (7) ecology where a significant proportion of site is covered by priority habitats or designated sites (8) lack of the potential to create suitable vehicular access (9) locational sustainability if (for residential) the site is disconnected from existing settlements (10) settlement character if the development of the site would be at odds with the existing pattern of development, where possible smaller cuts of larger sites were taken forward. |

| <b>Stage 1b Urban Capacity Study (UCS)</b>  |
|---|
| <b>Role:</b> Quantify the potential for accommodating new homes within the built-up area of Rugby. Supplements the HELAA.   |
| <b>Source of sites:</b> Specific urban call for sites, mapping to identify sites, HELAA, brownfield register, Reg 18 consultation responses, Rugby Regeneration Study, site visits.                   |
| <b>Number of sites considered:</b> 127, reduced to 107  |
| <b>Analysis:</b> GIS, desk-based review of constraints, site visits, viability analysis, where necessary contacting landowners to establish availability.   |
| <b>Possible outcomes:</b> Sites were assessed for suitability, availability and deliverability.   |
| <b>Reasons for discounting sites:</b> (1) extant planning permission (2) already identified as suitable, developable and available in the HELAA, (3) suitability (4) deliverability (5) availability. |

## Stage 2a detailed site assessment

**Role:** more detailed technical analysis or site constraints and opportunities.

This assessment was updated after the Regulation 18 preferred options consultation to incorporate the findings of the Strategic Transport Assessment, Green Belt study, level 2 SFRA and other new evidence.

**Source of sites:** sites assessed in the HELAA to be “not currently developable – changes to policy would be required”. Generally, sites from the UCS were not included in the Stage 2 site assessment as these sites within the urban area were assessed as suitable within that study and no changes to policy would be required for their development. The only exception to this is (a) sites found suitable, deliverable and available by the UCS which have not been progressed to allocation; and, (b) sites found undeliverable by the UCS which we are progressed as site allocations. The reasons for including these two categories of UCS in the stage 2 site assessment is to explain the reasons for departing from the UCS findings.

**Number of sites considered:** 115

### Analysis incorporated (where relevant):

- (1) site visits undertaken by officers to all sites.
- (2) Transport analysis of all sites by consultants SLR and sites analysed using the DfT connectivity tool
- (3) Consultation with National Highways on sites close to SRN
- (4) Consultation with Severn Trent Water.
- (5) Relevant outputs of the Level 2 Water Cycle Study
- (6) Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- (7) Whole plan viability assessment
- (8) Level 1 and 2 Green Belt study
- (9) Landscape assessment for Rainsbrook Valley
- (10) Areas of Separation Study
- (11) Urban Capacity Study
- (12) Viability study
- (13) Strategic Transport Assessment findings
- (14) School place planning advice from Warwickshire County Council and education modelling.
- (15) Landscape sensitivity assessment undertaken for all sites including site visits. For larger sites this was undertaken by Lepus Consulting, for smaller sites by RBC officers and subsequently verified by Lepus Consulting.
- (16) Ecological constraints assessment undertaken by Lepus Consulting. This was undertaken for sites which phase 1 habitat mapping suggest have a significant proportion of higher distinctiveness habitats on site; for sites with a local wildlife site on site or adjacent; and for sites within a site of special scientific interest impact risk zone for the type of development proposed.
- (17) Heritage assets assessment, including site visits, undertaken by Node. This was undertaken for sites with a designated heritage asset on site or which are likely to fall within the setting of a designated heritage asset. A preliminary desk-based review was undertaken by the council’s conservation officer to identify those sites requiring further assessment by Node.
- (18) Identification of opportunities. This considers opportunities both for the type of development proposed other public benefits that the development could deliver.

Possible outcomes: (1) site allocation (2) not progressed

| Stage 2b Sustainability Appraisal (SA)   |
|--|
| <p><b>Role:</b> The SA combines the ‘bottom up’ site analysis work of stages 1 and 2 with ‘top down’ strategic considerations, including development needs, to generate options for growth scenarios. Those growth scenarios are then appraised in terms of their sustainability and potential for significant environmental effects.</p>  |
| <p><b>Source of sites:</b> stage 2 site assessment.</p>  |
| <p><b>Number of sites considered:</b> Draws on sites identified through stage 2 site assessment, but considers other sites not progressed through other stages as well.</p>  |
| <p><b>Analysis:</b> analysis undertaken by SA consultant AECOM. Preferred option growth scenario selected by the council.</p>  |
| <p><b>Outputs:</b> Defined reasonable alternative spatial strategies, which will be presented as different growth scenarios. Testing those growth scenarios against the sustainability objectives set out in the SA framework. The appraisal informed the creation and then refinement of a preferred option. The appraisal will also identifies the potential for significant environmental effects in line with the requirements of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.</p> |