

Appendix A - Site Assessment Comparison Table

	WDL Site	Meriden Road Depot, Hampton in Arden	Land at Fillongley Road, Meriden	Land at Fillongley Road, Meriden	The Firs, Meriden - Northern Part of Site	The Firs, Meriden - Southern Part of Site	Land South of School Road, Hockley Heath	Land West of Stratford Road, Hockley Heath
Site Selection Step 1 - 'Site Hierarchy'								
Site Selection Step 1 Score (1-4 = Green, 5 = Yellow, 6-7 = Blue, 8-10 = Red.	5	3	5	5	5	5	6	6
Site Selection Step 2 - 'Site Refinement'								
Allocation status	Red Site	Green Site (Proposed for Allocation as Site 6)	Red Site	Red Site	Green Site (Proposed for Allocation as Site 10)	Green Site (Proposed for Allocation as Site 10)	Green Site (Proposed for Allocation as Site 25)	Red Site
Step 2 Assessment Reference	Reference 6	Reference 117	Reference 81	Reference 144	Reference 137	Reference 119	Reference 139	Reference 121
Assessment Page	83	101	587	597	595	591	349	347
Site Capacity	90	110	100	118	38 (Combined Capacity now 100)	30 (Combined Capacity now 100)	139	81
Green Belt	100	100	99	100	100	100	100	100
Greenfield/Brownfield	Greenfield	Brownfield	Predominantly Greenfield	Greenfield	Part greenfield, part brownfield (however, it appears that the area that is brownfield from this section of the site has been removed).	Predominantly Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield
Constraints	GB, TPO, Habitats of Wildlife Interest	GB, PROW, Entire site is contaminated land, Flood Zone 3	GB, Mineral Safeguarding, Access, Habitats of Wildlife Interest, PROW	GB, Mineral Safeguarding, Access, Sewage Pumping Station and Balancing Pond	GB, TPOs on Site, Existing Property Uses, Trees on Site.	GB, Mineral Safeguarding, TPOs on Boundary, Adjacent to Listed Building, Contaminated land on greater part of site, Existing Uses on Site.	GB, TPOs on Boundary, Adjacent to canal, hedgerows, telegraph poles	GB, TPO along Boundary, Access, Habitats and PROW along boundary.
SHELAA Category (Category 1 = Could commence, Category 2 = Sites with some constraints, Category 3 = Not currently)	Cat.1	Category 3 (Significant Suitability Constraints)	Category 2 (Some suitability and achievability constraints)	Category 1	Cat. 1	Category 2 (Some suitability constraints)	Category 1	Category 2
Accessibility Study								
Primary School	Very High	Medium	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High
Food Store	High	Low	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High
GP Surgery	High	Low/Medium	Medium	Medium	Low/Medium	Low/Medium	Very Low	Very Low
Public Transport	Very High	Very High	Low/Medium	Medium	Very High	Very High	Low/Medium	Low/Medium
Overall	Very High	Medium	High	High	High	High	Medium/High	Medium
Access	No existing footway	No existing footway provision	Existing Footway	Existing Footway	No existing footway	Existing Footway	No Existing Footway Provision	Existing Footway
Green Belt Assessment								
Parcel	RP19	RP22	RP25	RP25	RP25	RP24, Partly 25	RP49	RP49
Combined Score	4	5	5	5	5	0, 5 respectively.	5	5
Comments	Moderate Purpose 1	Moderate Purpose 1 and 3	High Purpose 1	High Purpose 1	High Purpose 1	Does not perform against GB Purposes	Moderately Performing Purpose 2 and 3.	Moderately performing Purpose 2 and 3.
Landscape Character Assessment								
Parcel	LCA9	LCA8	LCA7	LCA7	LCA7	LCA7	LCA2	LCA2
Landscape Character Sensitivity	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	High	High	High
Visual Sensitivity	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	High	High
Landscape Value	Low	Varies from Low to High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Landscape Capacity to Accommodate Change	Low	Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low	Very Low
Sustainability Appraisal								
Significant Positive	0	0	4	4	3	3	1	1
Positive	5	1	3	3	3	3	4	4
Neutral	8	11	5	5	5	5	6	6
Negative	4	4	5	5	6	6	6	6
Significant Negative	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary and Analysis	Suitable for development. Comments on indefensible boundaries and visual intrusion	"Would be well contained by the existing boundary to the East."	Would result in an indefensible boundary to the West. Suitable for limited expansion, but defensible boundary would incorporate significant land.	Would result in an indefensible boundary to the east and west. Settlement identified as suitable for limited expansion, but defensible boundaries would incorporate significant land.	Would result in an indefensible boundary to the South-West. Settlement is identified for limited expansion and site is well related to the centre of the village	Would result in an indefensible boundary to the North-East.	Well Constrained by physical and permanent features that would provide strong and defensible boundaries.	"No permanent physical features are present to establish a strong defensible Green Belt boundary." Would be an incursion of built form into open countryside.
Indefensible Boundaries?	North and East	None	West	East and West	South-West	North East	None	West
Boundary constitution	Tree Belts exist to the North and East of the site, both of which run along the full length of the boundaries. The Northern Tree Belt (planted 2015) is 10 metres in width. The Eastern Tree Belt (planted 1998/99) ranges from 18m to 39m in width, with an average of around 22m width.	None	Existing Housing deemed insufficient at the West.	East - open with small hedgerow. Therefore both somewhat understandable. West - smaller hedgerow.	Now mitigated as it is the joining boundary with the South of the site.	Now mitigated as it is the joining boundary with the North of the site.	None	Relatively strong tree line.
Perceived Defensible Boundaries		East Boundary - Currently a small dirt road. Proposed to be landscaped - sufficient here. South Boundary (not mentioned as indefensible) is not significant.	North Boundary - A Road. West Boundary - Railway		North - Strong Tree Lined Boundary sufficient East - Strong Tree Lined Boundary sufficient	South - Hedgerow fronting road deemed sufficient	South - Canal.	N/A
Mitigation	The aforementioned Advanced Planting, which has ensured significant Tree Belts, has not been accepted by SMBC.	Landscaping of the eastern boundary is deemed sufficient - inconsistent.	Does discuss how mitigation could be applied.	Does discuss how mitigation could be applied.	Mitigation found through the merging of sites. But interesting that strong hedgerows are considered sufficient here.	Interesting that, in the overall scheme, strong hedgerows are deemed sufficient	N/A	N/A