

**Core Strategy Development
Plan Document (DPD)**
Core Strategy for Submission

Sustainability Appraisal Report:
Appendices

December 2008

Client: Hertsmere Borough Council

Appendices (separate document)

Appendix A - Summary of Scoping Report Consultation Comments

Appendix B – Relevant objectives, targets and indicators

Appendix C – Baseline Data Tables

Appendix D - Policy Options Assessment

Appendix E - Assessment of Preferred Policy Options (November 2006)

Appendix F - Assessment of Additional Preferred Policies (April 2007)

Appendix G – Summary of draft SAR Consultation Comments

APPENDIX A

Summary of Scoping Report Consultation Comments

Table 1: Consultation Responses

| Consultee | Comment | Hertsmere Borough Council response |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Hertfordshire County Council | <p>Include the following relevant plans, policies and programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ EU Sixth Environmental Action Plan ➤ Sustainable Communities – Building for the Future ➤ The Future of Transport White Paper ➤ Draft SEA Scoping Report for Hertfordshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy | Noted. The requested plans, policies and programmes have been added to Tables 2.1 to 2.5 inclusive, and their content and implications considered in Appendix 1 and Table 2.6. |
| Hertfordshire County Council | Baseline information very detailed and well thought through. | Support noted. |
| Hertfordshire County Council | Consider the issues arising from the review of plans, programmes and policies in the identification of key sustainability issues. | Noted. The revisions made to the Scoping Report should provide a clearer link between existing plans, policies and objectives, the identification of key sustainability issues and setting of objectives. |
| Hertfordshire County Council | It is not very clear which of the Sustainability Objectives are specifically devised in relation to the plan and which are relevant to the requirements of the SEA Directive. | Table 5.1 links the SA objectives and indicators to the relevant topics in the SEA Directive. |
| Hertfordshire County Council | The number of objectives and indicators seems right. | Support noted. |
| Hertfordshire County Council | The indicators suggested provide a useful measure for the Sustainability Framework objectives. | Support noted. |
| Cllr Neil Payne | <p>Include the following relevant plans, policies, actions and programmes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ SMILE – A cultural strategy for Hertsmere ➤ Housing Strategy 2004-2007 | Noted. The requested plans, policies and programmes have been added to Tables 2.1 to 2.5 inclusive, and their content and implications considered in Appendix 1 and Table 2.6. |

APPENDIX B

Relevant objectives, targets and indicators

Table 2: Relevant objectives, targets & indicators

| Relevant objectives, targets & indicators | Implications for SA / SEA |
|---|---|
| INTERNATIONAL | |
| Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992) | |
| <p>The UNFCCC was adopted on 9th May 1992. It set out to achieve stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at safe levels. The text of the Kyoto Protocol was adopted at the third session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC in Kyoto, Japan, on 11 December 1997.</p> <p>Objectives The ultimate objective of the Convention is to “achieve stabilization of atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases at levels that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic (human-induced) interference with the climate system...”.</p> <p>The Convention does not define what levels might be “dangerous”, although it does state that ecosystems should be allowed to adapt naturally, food supply should not be threatened, and economic development should be able to proceed in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>Targets The Protocol set out a series of targets for specific greenhouse gases and established a framework of actions and requirements to meet these targets with the aim of achieving in a meaningful timeframe (up to 2012, with 1990 levels used as base) the objective of the UN Framework Convention. The two agreements are thus intrinsically linked with the Protocol essentially acting as a template for action to meet the commitments made in the Framework Convention.</p> | Reducing greenhouse gas emissions will be a key sustainability issue for Hertsmere. Will need to consider all potential sources, including travel, pollution, energy and waste. |
| The World Summit in Sustainable Development, Johannesburg (2002) | |
| <p>A number of the sustainable development commitments originating from WSSD, are relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate energy into country-led poverty reduction processes; • Remove market barriers and create a level playing field for renewable energy and energy efficiency; • Greater resource efficiency (incl. decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation); • Support business innovation and take-up of best practice in technology and management; work on waste and producer responsibility. | Promoting resources efficiency and business innovation will be the most relevant aspects. |
| Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (1979) | |
| <p>Objectives The aims of the convention are threefold:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to conserve wild flora and fauna and natural habitats • to promote co-operation between States • to give particular attention to endangered and vulnerable species, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species <p>There is a general obligation for each Contracting Party to take action individually, with respect to the conservation of wild flora and fauna and all natural habitats in general, through:</p> <p>Promotion of national policies for the conservation of wild flora, wild fauna and natural habitats; Integration of the conservation of wild flora and fauna into national planning, development and environmental policies; Promotion of education and disseminate information on the need to conserve species of wild flora and fauna and their habitats.</p> | Wildlife and habitat conservation will be key sustainability issues and potential objectives. |
| Bonn Convention on Conservation of Migratory Species (1979) | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Objectives Promote, co-operate and support research relating to migratory species; Endeavour to provide immediate protection for migratory species included in Appendix I; and Endeavour to conclude Agreements covering the conservation and management of migratory species included in Appendix II.</p> <p>The Convention was agreed based on: Recognition that wild animals in their innumerable forms are an irreplaceable part of the earth's natural system which must be conserved for the good of mankind Awareness that each generation of man holds the resources of the earth for future generations and has an obligation to South America, Asia, Europe and Oceania. ensure that this legacy is conserved and, where utilised, is used wisely Consciousness of the ever-growing value of wild animals from environmental, ecological, genetic, scientific, aesthetic, recreational, cultural, educational, social and economic points of view Concern particularly with those species of wild animals that migrate across or outside national jurisdictional boundaries Recognition that the States are and must be the protectors of the migratory species of wild animals that live within or pass through their national jurisdictional boundaries The conviction that conservation and effective management of migratory species of wild animals require the concerted action of all States within the national jurisdictional boundaries of which such species spend any part of their life cycle</p> | <p>Need to ensure that migratory species are considered as well as local species.</p> |
| <p>Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora (Directive 92/43/EC) (The Habitats Directive)</p> | |
| <p>Objectives to contribute towards ensuring bio-diversity through the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora in the European territory of the Member States to which the Treaty applies. maintain or restore, at favourable conservation status, natural habitats and species of wild fauna and flora of Community interest. take account of economic, social and cultural requirements and regional and local characteristics.</p> | <p>Consider including conservation of flora and fauna / habitat as specific SA objective.</p> |
| <p>EU Air Quality Framework Directive (96/62/EC)</p> | |
| <p>In zones and agglomerations in which levels of one of more pollutants exceed certain limit values Member States shall prepare and implement a plan or programme for attaining the limit value within the specific time limit. In zones and agglomerations, where the level of more than one pollutant is higher than the limit values, member states must provide an integrated plan covering all the pollutants concerned to improve air quality.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain adequate information on ambient air quality and ensure that it is made available to the public, inter alia by means of alert thresholds, • Maintain ambient air quality where it is good and improve it in other cases. <p>Targets</p> <p>Introduces air quality standards for previously unregulated air pollutants, setting the timetable for the development of daughter directives on a range of pollutants. The list of atmospheric pollutants to be considered includes sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, lead, ozone, benzene, carbon monoxide, poly-aromatic hydrocarbons, cadmium, arsenic, nickel and mercury.</p> | <p>Air quality is a key sustainability issue. Meeting targets, esp near major roads, will be a challenge. SA objective needed to ensure this is considered throughout LDF preparation.</p> |
| <p>EU Directive to Promote Electricity from Renewable Energy (2001/77/EC)</p> | |
| <p>Objectives Promote an increase in the contribution of renewable energy sources to electricity production in the internal market for electricity and to create a basis for a future Community framework thereof.</p> | <p>Promoting renewable energy to meet national target will be a key sustainability issue for Hertsmere. Include specific SA objective.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Targets The UK target is for renewables to account for 10% of UK consumption by 2010.</p> | |
| <p>EU Water Framework Directive (00/60/EC)</p> | |
| <p>Promotes cleaner rivers, lakes, groundwater and coastal beaches. Introduces the single system of water management based on river basins, many of which cross administrative and national boundaries. Identifies five environmental objectives:</p> <p>No deterioration of status for surface and groundwaters and the protection, enhancement and restoration of all water bodies; Achievement of good status by 2015, i.e. good ecological status (or potential) and good chemical status for surface waters and good chemical and good quantitative status for groundwaters; Progressive reduction of pollution of priority substances and phase-out of priority hazardous substances in surface waters and prevention and limitation of input of pollutants in groundwaters; Reversal of any significant, upward trend of pollutants in groundwaters; Achievement of standards and objectives set for protected areas in Community legislation.</p> | <p>Preserving and enhancing surface and groundwater sources, and reducing sources of pollution will be incorporated into objectives and indicators.</p> |
| <p>EU Sustainable Development Strategy</p> | |
| <p>Objectives: Limit climate change and increase the use of clean energy Address threats to public health (e.g. hazardous chemicals, food safety) Combat poverty and social exclusion Deal with the economic and social implications of an ageing society Manage natural resources more responsibly (including biodiversity and waste generation) Improve the transport system and land use management</p> <p>Targets: Raise the employment rate to 67% for January 2005 and to 70% by 2010; increase the number of women in employment to 57% for January 2005 and to more than 60% by 2010. Halve by 2010 the number of 18 to 24 year olds with only lower secondary education who are not in further education and training. Increase the average EU employment rate among older women and men (55-64) to 50% by 2010. Meet its Kyoto commitment then aim to reduce atmospheric greenhouse gas emissions by an average of 1% per year over 1990 levels up to 2020. By 2020, ensure that chemicals are only produced and used in ways that do not pose significant threats to human health and the environment. Protect and restore habitats and natural systems and halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010. Bring about a shift in transport use from road to rail, water and public passenger transport so that the share of road transport in 2010 is no greater than in 1998 (the most recent year Key European context Key European context for which data are available).</p> | <p>SA objectives should reflect key SDS objectives and take targets into account where relevant to local level.</p> |
| <p>EU Spatial Development Perspective</p> | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Emphasises the importance of achieving, equally in all regions of the EU, the three fundamental goals of European policy: Economic and social cohesion; Conservation and management of natural resources and the cultural heritage; and More balanced competitiveness of the European territory.</p> | <p>SA to ensure balanced social, economic and environmental appraisal of LDF. Ensure SA objectives reflect these equally.</p> |
| <p>EU Sixth Environmental Action Programme of the European Community 2002-2012</p> | |
| <p>The programme identifies four environmental areas for priority actions: Climate Change; Nature and biodiversity; Environment and Health and Quality of Life; Natural Resources and Waste.</p> | <p>SA objectives to ensure these factors are considered.</p> |
| <p>European Biodiversity Strategy</p> | |
| <p>Developed around four major themes: Conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity Sharing of benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources Research, identification, monitoring and exchange of information Education, training and awareness</p> | <p>Include biodiversity objective in SA</p> |
| <p>NATIONAL</p> | |
| <p>Securing the Future - UK Sustainable Development Strategy</p> | |
| <p>Key Principles Living Within Environmental Limits: Respect the limits of the planet's environment, resources and biodiversity, improve our environment and ensure that the natural resources needed for life are unimpaired and remain so for future generations. Ensuring a Strong, Healthy and Just Society: Meet the diverse needs of all people in existing and future communities, promote personal wellbeing, social cohesion and inclusion, and create equal opportunity for all. Achieving a Sustainable Economy: Build a strong, stable and sustainable economy which provides prosperity and opportunities for all, and in which environmental and social costs fall on those who impose them, and provide incentives for efficient resource use. Promoting Good Governance: Actively promote effective, participative systems of governance in all levels of society – engaging Using Sound Science Responsibly: Ensure policy is developed and implemented on the basis of strong scientific evidence, whilst taking into account scientific uncertainty (through the precautionary principle) as well as public attitudes and values. Indicators: Introduces 64 'UK Framework Indicators' to give an overview of sustainable development and the priority areas in the UK. Some indicators are still being developed (eg. well-being index).</p> | <p>SA to ensure balanced social, economic and environmental appraisal. Consider relevance of the 64 UK Framework Indicators when developing local SA indicators to ensure compatibility.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Working with the grain of Nature – A biodiversity strategy for England</p> <p>The Strategy sets out a series of actions that will be taken by the Government and its partners to make biodiversity a fundamental consideration in:</p> <p>Agriculture: encouraging the management of farming and agricultural land so as to conserve and enhance biodiversity as part of the Government's Sustainable Food and Farming Strategy.</p> <p>Water: aiming for a whole catchment approach to the wise, sustainable use of water and wetlands.</p> <p>Woodland: managing and extending woodland so as to promote enhanced biodiversity and quality of life.</p> <p>Marine and coastal management: so as to achieve the sustainable use and management of our coasts and seas using natural processes and the ecosystem-based approach.</p> <p>Urban areas: where biodiversity needs to become a part of the development of policy on sustainable communities and urban green space and the built environment.</p> | <p>Include biodiversity objective / indicators</p> <p>Includes information on UK sustainable development indicators for biodiversity. Links to leisure, health and access objectives are also compatible. SA report should include some references to the importance of maintaining biodiversity to overcome the gap in the strategy.</p> |
| <p>UK Climate Change Programme (2000)</p> <p>Details how the UK plans to deliver its Kyoto target to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% and move toward National goal to cut carbon dioxide emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2010.</p> <p>Aims</p> <p>Improve business's use of energy, stimulate investment and cut costs;</p> <p>Stimulate new, more efficient sources of power generation;</p> <p>Cut emissions from the transport sector;</p> <p>Promote better energy efficiency in the domestic sector.</p> | <p>Energy use, domestic and business energy efficiency, and sustainable travel should be considered as potential SA objectives</p> |
| <p>DETR (2000) Government Urban White Paper: Our Towns and Cities: the Future – Delivering an Urban Renaissance</p> <p>Promotes positive planning in urban areas based around a number of key themes:</p> <p>To accommodate the new homes we will need by 2021 through a strategy that uses the available land, including, in particular, brownfield land and existing buildings in urban areas wisely to create homes which people will find attractive and planning carefully any expansion of urban areas;</p> <p>To encourage people to remain and move back into urban areas, particularly the centres of our major cities and conurbations, by making them places which offer a good quality of life. This means having an attractive urban environment employment opportunities and good quality services;</p> <p>To tackle the poor quality of life and lack of opportunity in certain urban areas as a matter of social justice, to enable all to share in and contribute to our growing prosperity and to enhance the overall attractiveness of cities to people and business;</p> <p>To strengthen the factors in all urban areas which will enhance their economic success especially in those areas with a wider regional impact; and</p> <p>To make sustainable urban living practical, affordable and attractive to enable us to reduce the emissions, waste products and other local and global environmental impacts.</p> | <p>Promoting efficient and sustainable living will be reflected in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>DETR (2000) Government Rural White Paper: Our Countryside: The Future – A Fair Deal for Rural England</p> <p>Promotes positive planning in rural areas based around a number of key themes:</p> <p>For country residents:</p> <p>Investment in better public services – schools, health, transport and crime reduction – and a rural service standard, reviewed annually;</p> <p>3,000 new affordable homes every year in small settlements;</p> <p>Access to a wide range of day-to-day transactions through post offices, internet and local small businesses;</p> <p>A bigger say in community planning.</p> <p>For rural businesses:</p> <p>Investment in market towns and more targeted help from Regional Development Agencies;</p> <p>Better transport, ICT coverage, skills training and business advice;</p> <p>Potential reduction in rate bills</p> <p>For farmers:</p> | <p>Promoting efficient and sustainable living will be reflected in SA objectives</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>More money for agri-environment schemes; marketing grants, and tailored business advice to help modernise and improve agricultural, horticultural and forestry holdings; Help with planning to enable farmers to use surplus farm buildings and less burdensome regulation generally; Help with diversification, marketing and skill training; Support for small and medium sized abattoirs; For everyone: Stronger protection for our most valued landscapes, and for wildlife and habitats; More access and a better rights of way network; A living, working countryside maintained for the benefit of us all, wherever we live</p> | |
| <p>Environment Agency (2001) Water Resources for the Future – A Strategy for England and Wales</p> | |
| <p>Objectives Promote water efficiency – expect household water metering to become widespread over the next 25 years. Pay further attention to leakage control. Promote water sensitive agricultural practices; farmers should consider crop suitability and the possibility of increased winter storage. Active promotion of water efficiency opportunities for commerce and industry. Deliver the sustainable development of water resources through working together.</p> <p>Targets Enhancement of water supply by up to 1100 Ml/d above present levels by the improvement of existing schemes and the development of some new resources.</p> | <p>Efficient use of water a key resource issue in Hertfordshire. Should be reflect in SA objectives.</p> |
| <p>DEFRA (2004) Making space for water: Developing a new Government strategy for flood and coastal erosion risk management in England</p> | |
| <p>Aims and objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent decline in current flood defence standards to improve the situation, consider possible need for extreme flood protection measures • Outlines the importance of a holistic approach, not just putting up defences but finding cost effective means of prevention • Shows the importance of sustainable development (to include elements to do with the environment, and flood management solutions while taking the local communities views into consideration | <p>Flood risk will be an important topic within the SA process. The objectives contained within this document could be used as indicators.</p> |
| <p>DETR (2000) The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Working together for clean air (2000)</p> | |
| <p>Objectives The Strategy sets objectives for eight main air pollutants to protect health. Performance against these objectives will be monitored where people are regularly present and might be exposed to air pollution. There are also two new objectives to protect vegetation and ecosystems which will be monitored away from urban and industrial areas and motorways. Local authorities in England, Scotland and Wales are required to review and assess air quality in their area against the objectives specified for each pollutant in their respective Air Quality Standards regulations.</p> <p>The objectives in the Strategy have been set with regard to the scientific and medical evidence on the effects of particular pollutants on health.</p> <p>Targets Contains a number of pollutant specific national air quality targets that were updated by DEFRA in August 2002.</p> | <p>Air quality and human health will be important topics within the SA process. The objectives contained within this document could be used as indicators.</p> |
| <p>DEFRA (2004) The First Soil Action Plan for England: 2004-2006</p> | |
| <p>Actions Contains 52 actions on soil related issues including soil management on farms, the planning system, biodiversity, contamination and the role of soils in conserving cultural heritage and landscape. The actions aim to ensure more sustainable soil use and protection.</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>The first milestone will be to examine criteria for designating soils that should be protected from building during the current review of Best and Most</p> | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Versatile (BMV) land. English Nature will prepare and publish, in 2006, a position statement on the role of soil management and protection within statutory nature conservation sites.</p> <p>Indicators Defra will work with stakeholders to identify the indicators which should be built into a national soil monitoring scheme, in order to develop a scheme which meets both national and European requirements.</p> | |
| <p>UK Waste Strategy</p> <p>The European policies and targets for waste, have been reflected in the Government's own national Waste Strategy and PPS10. The Waste Strategy is based on the following concepts:</p> <p>Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO): Intended to establish, for a given set of objectives, the waste management option that provides the most benefits or the least damage to the environment as a whole, at an acceptable cost, in the long term as well as the short term.</p> <p>Proximity Principle: Waste should be processed or disposed of as near as possible to the point of its production. The intention is, in part, to discourage waste authorities from exporting their "waste problem" to other regions. The principle recognises that transporting waste long distances can have significant environmental impact and promotes the establishment of locally based waste management facilities aimed at reducing these environmental impacts with possible financial benefits.</p> <p>Regional Self-Sufficiency: Most waste should be treated or disposed of within the region in which it is produced. In the East of England region, county self-sufficiency is seen as an essential building block of this policy.</p> <p>Waste Hierarchy: The waste hierarchy provides a theoretical framework to be used as a guide for ranking the waste management options being considered as part of the BPEO assessment.</p> <p>Reduction - the most effective environmental solution is to reduce the amount of waste being presented for disposal.</p> <p>Re-Use – the re-use of items for the same or different purpose.</p> <p>Recycling – the recovery of value from waste material through recycling, composting, or recovery of energy.</p> <p>Disposal – as a last resort, if none of the above can offer an appropriate solution, the waste should be disposed of.</p> | <p>Key principles, especially the waste hierarchy, should be considered in developing Hertsmere's SA objectives</p> <p>Encouraging better waste management will help to achieve SA objectives encouraging sustainable waste management. Depending on implementation of policy improvements to objectives based on renewable energy sources and limiting pollution / contamination can be achieved.</p> |
| <p>Energy White Paper: Our energy Future – creating a low carbon economy</p> <p>Aims to put ourselves on a path to cut the UK's carbon dioxide emissions - the main contributor to global warming - by some 60% by about 2050, as recommended by the RCEP, with real progress by 2020; to maintain the reliability of energy supplies; to promote competitive markets in the UK and beyond, helping to raise the rate of sustainable economic growth and to improve our productivity; and to ensure that every home is adequately and affordably heated.</p> <p>Contains quantified targets for a number of policies, including carbon emissions (see objectives), electricity from renewable sources (10% by 2010, 20% by 2020) and the industrial use of oil and gas.</p> | <p>Encouraging renewable energy could meet the following areas generally SA objectives: Promote more sustainable development - To encourage a diverse economy</p> |
| <p>Saving lives: Our Healthier Nation White Paper</p> <p>Objectives Improve the health of the population as a whole by increasing the length of life and the number of years people spend free from illness Improve the health of the worst off in society and narrow the health gap.</p> <p>Targets Reduce the death rate from cancer in people under 75 by at least one fifth; Reduce the death rate from coronary heart disease and stroke and related diseases in people under 75 by at least two fifths;</p> | <p>Consider improving health of the population as potential SA objective; take targets into account</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Reduce the death rate from suicide and undetermined injury by at least one fifth; Reduce the death rate from accidents by at least one fifth and to reduce the rate of serious injury from accidents by at least one tenth.</p> | |
| <p>The Future of Transport – White Paper</p> | |
| <p>Looks at the factors that will shape travel and transport over the next 30 years. Sets out how the Government intends to respond to the increasing demand for travel by maximising the benefits of transport while minimising the negative impact on people and the environment.</p> | <p>Consideration will be given to development being located in sustainable locations as an SA objective.</p> |
| <p>Sustainable Communities – Building for the Future (ODPM 2003)</p> <p>Promotes measures to tackle the housing provisions and mis-match between the South-East and part of the North and Midlands. The plan has allocated to it £22 billion to take affordable housing, housing supply, growth areas, homelessness, social housing and refurbishment schemes.</p> <p>To ensure that all social tenants have a decent home by 2010 To improve conditions for vulnerable people in private accommodation. To ensure all tenants, social and private, get an excellent service from their landlord. To ensure all communities have a clean, safe and attractive environment in which people can take pride. Most of our cities are thriving. But we need to: bring life back to those areas, most notably in the North and the Midlands, where there is low demand for housing, and where – in the worst cases – homes have been abandoned; recreate sustainable communities; ensure we prevent the repetition of such serious problems in the the longer term; support the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal by tackling the deprivation prevalent in low demand areas. To tackle the housing shortage, especially in London and the wider South East, by: creating conditions in which private house builders will build more homes of the right type in the right places; addressing immediate and urgent needs for more affordable housing, both for key workers and those who would otherwise be homeless; making best use of the existing housing stock. To work towards a better balance in the housing market in the longer term. To do all this in a way that ensures communities are sustainable, enhances the overall environment and protects the countryside. To ensure that in tackling housing shortages we protect the countryside and enhance its quality rather than create urban sprawl. To address the housing needs of rural communities who are often the guardians of the countryside. To accommodate the economic success of London and the wider South East and ensure that the international competitiveness of the region is sustained, for the benefit of the region and the whole country. To alleviate pressures on services and housing caused by economic success where these pressures cannot readily be dealt with within existing towns and cities. Where new and expanded communities are needed, to ensure that these are sustainable, well-designed, high quality and attractive places in which people will positively choose to live and work. To ensure the right framework of laws, structures and decision making processes, and the right skills, to support the agenda in this action programme.</p> | |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts</p> | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population; Provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas; Retain attractive landscapes, and enhance townscapes, near to where people live; Improve damaged & derelict land around towns; Secure nature conservation interest; and Retain land in agricultural, forestry & related uses.</p> | <p>Reflect in SA objectives for 'land use' and 'liveable communities'</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing Meet all housing requirements Everyone should have the opportunity of a decent home; There should be greater choice of housing and housing should not reinforce social distinctions; The housing needs of all in the community should be recognised, including those in need of affordable or special housing in both urban and rural areas; Additional housing should be focused in towns and cities; and New housing and residential environments should be well designed. Make more efficient use of land By 2008 achieve 60% of new housing on PDL Seek to reduce car dependency Encourage housing densities of between 30 to 50 dwellings per ha.</p> | <p>Housing is key issue to be addressed through SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 4: Industrial, commercial development and small firms Encourage continued economic development that is compatible with governmental environmental objectives. New development can be encouraged in locations that: Minimise the length and number of trips by motor vehicle; Can be served by energy efficient modes of transport; Will not add unacceptably to congestion; and Access roads appropriate to the length of journey.</p> | <p>To be covered by SA economy and travel objectives</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 8: Telecommunications Sets policy relating to telecommunications development - including radio masts and towers, antennas of all kinds, radio equipment housing, public call boxes, cabinets, poles and overhead wires. Provides detailed development control guidance.</p> | <p>Not particularly relevant at this stage; consider during detailed DPD preparation.</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport</p> | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight; Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and Reduce the need to travel, especially by car.</p> | <p>Include SA objectives covering sustainable transport/ reducing journey length</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the historic environment</p> | |
| <p>Conserving the historic environment is important to sustainable development. Cultural heritage is an irreplaceable resource. The physical survivals of the past should be valued and protected for their own sake</p> | <p>Consider SA objective relating to protection of historic environment</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 16: Archaeology and Planning</p> | |
| <p>Development plans should reconcile the need for development with the interests of conservation including archaeology and should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their settings.</p> | <p>Consider SA objective relating to protection of historic environment</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation</p> | |
| <p>Open spaces, sport and recreation all underpin people's quality of life. Well-designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are therefore fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives:</p> <p>Supporting an urban renaissance Supporting a rural renewal Promotion of social inclusion and community cohesion Health and well being Promoting more sustainable development</p> <p>The location of new areas of open space, sports and recreational facilities, should promote objectives including accessibility, regeneration and social inclusion.</p> | <p>Reflect broader objectives in SA objs covering well-being and liveable communities</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 19: Outdoor advertisement control</p> | |
| <p>Provides guidance on the consideration of outdoor advertising proposals to balance the economic importance of advertising with the need for good design. Provides detailed guidance on development controls for advertising.</p> | <p>Not particularly relevant at this stage; consider during detailed DPD preparation.</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 24: Planning and noise</p> | |
| <p>The planning system can be used to minimise the adverse impact of noise without placing unreasonable restrictions on development or adding unduly to the costs and administrative burdens of business.</p> | <p>Consider including as part of well-being objectives</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Guidance Note 25: Development and flood risk</p> | |
| <p>Flood risk should be considered at all stages of the planning and development process in order to reduce future damage.</p> <p>The susceptibility of land to flooding is a material planning consideration; The Environment Agency has the lead role in providing advice on flood issues, at a strategic level and in relation to planning applications; Policies in development plans should outline the consideration which will be given to flood issues, Recognising the uncertainties that are inherent in the prediction of flooding and that flood risk is expected to increase as a result of climate change; Planning authorities should apply the precautionary principle to the issue of flood risk, using a risk based search sequence to avoid such risk where</p> | <p>Consider including flood risk as part of well-being / climate change SA objectives</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>possible and managing it elsewhere; Planning authorities should recognise the importance of functional flood plains, where water flows or is held at times of flood, and avoid inappropriate development on undeveloped and undefended flood plains Developers should fund the provision and maintenance of flood defences that are required because of the development; and Planning policies and decisions should recognise that the consideration of flood risk and its management needs to be applied on a whole-catchment basis and not be restricted to flood plains.</p> | |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 1: Creating sustainable development Planning should facilitate and promote sustainable patterns of urban and rural development by: Making suitable land available for development in line with economic, social and environmental objectives to improve the quality of life. Contributing to sustainable economic growth. Protecting and where possible enhancing the natural and historic environment and the quality and character of the countryside, and existing successful communities. Ensuring high quality development through good design. Ensuring that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, accessible, sustainable communities</p> | <p>Overarches several potential SA themes; most relevant to 'land use' and 'liveable communities'. Consider including objective that reflects</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for town centres Promote the vitality and viability of city, town and other centres; Promote and enhance existing centres, by focusing development in centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment, accessible to all.</p> | <p>Liveable communities to be reflected in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable development in rural areas</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Raise the quality of life and the environment in rural areas through the promotion of: thriving, inclusive and sustainable rural communities, ensuring people have decent places to live by improving the quality and sustainability of local environments and neighbourhoods; sustainable economic growth and diversification; good quality, sustainable development that respects and, where possible, enhances local distinctiveness and the intrinsic qualities of the countryside; and continued protection of the open countryside for the benefit of all, with the highest level of protection for our most valued landscapes and environmental resources.</p> <p>Promote more sustainable patterns of development: focusing most development in, or next to, existing towns and villages; preventing urban sprawl; discouraging the development of 'greenfield' land, and, where such land must be used, ensuring it is not used wastefully; promoting a range of uses to maximise the potential benefits of the countryside fringing urban areas; and providing appropriate leisure opportunities to enable urban and rural dwellers to enjoy the wider countryside.</p> | <p>Reflected in land use SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</p> | |
| <p>To promote sustainable development – by ensuring that biodiversity is conserved and enhanced as an integral part of economic, social and environmental development, so that policies and decisions about the development and use of land integrate biodiversity with other considerations. To conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England’s wildlife and geology – by sustaining, and where possible improving, the quality and extent of natural habitat and geological and geomorphological sites; the natural physical processes on which they depend; and the populations of naturally occurring species which they support. To contribute to an urban renaissance – by enhancing biodiversity in green spaces and among developments in urban areas so that they are used by wildlife and valued by people, recognising that healthy functional ecosystems can contribute to a better quality of life and a sense of well-being for those who live and work in urban areas. To contribute to rural renewal – by ensuring that developments in rural areas take account of the role and value of biodiversity in supporting economic diversification and contributing to a high quality environment.</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for sustainable waste management</p> | |
| <p>Objectives: help deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy, addressing waste as a resource and looking to disposal as the last option, but one which must be adequately catered for; provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste, and enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities;</p> | <p>Encouraging better waste management will help to achieve SA objectives encouraging sustainable waste management. Depending on implementation of policy improvements to objectives based on</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>help implement the national waste strategy, and supporting targets, are consistent with obligations required under European legislation and support and complement other guidance and legal controls such as those set out in the Waste Management Licensing Regulations 1994; help secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment, and enable waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations; reflect the concerns and interests of communities, the needs of waste collection authorities, waste disposal authorities and business, and encourage competitiveness; protect green belts but recognise the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities when defining detailed green belt boundaries and, in determining planning applications, that these locational needs, together with the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management, are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be given planning permission; – ensure the design and layout of new development supports sustainable waste management.</p> | <p>renewable energy sources and limiting pollution / contamination can be achieved</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks Provides guidance for LDF preparation process.</p> | <p>Procedures rather than objectives are most relevant. SA preparation, monitoring and review are key requirements.</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable energy DPDs should contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources. Local planning authorities should recognise the full range of renewable energy sources, their differing characteristics, locational requirements and the potential for exploiting them subject to appropriate environmental safeguards.</p> | <p>Consider 'encouraging renewable energy' as SA objective</p> |
| <p>Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and pollution control Reduce air and water pollution Manage waste in a sustainable manner Use brownfield / contaminated land sites to maintain or enhance biodiversity Advises that: The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of development which may give rise to pollution, either directly or indirectly, and in ensuring that other uses and developments are not, as far as possible, affected by major existing or potential sources of pollution; The presence of contamination in land can present risks to human health and the environment, which adversely affect or restrict the beneficial use of land but development presents an opportunity to deal with these risks successfully;</p> | <p>Reduction of pollution and remediation of contamination should be covered in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM, 2005) Provides guidance on the preparation and monitoring of LDFs, including SA/SEA how LDFs should relate to community strategies and other documents. Identifies key contextual indicator topics and core output indicators for LDFs. Key contextual topics for indicators Demographic structure: population size, household types, ethnic composition, and social groups; Socio-cultural issues: crime rates, unemployment level and deprivation; Economy: economic activity rates, household income, house price level, productivity and employment; Environment: key assets in the natural environment; Housing and built environment: housing stock conditions and quality and assets of the built environment; and Transport and spatial connectivity: transport accessibility, regional hub, spatial inequality/uneven distribution of activities. LDF core output indicators</p> | <p>Key guidance for SA/SEA process and how to integrate with LDF preparation. Contextual indicators topics relevant to SA/SEA baseline. Output indicators generally not appropriate for SA/SEA but will need to be incorporated into LDF monitoring.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

- 1a Amount of land developed for employment by type.
- 1b Amount of land developed for employment, by type, which is in development and/or regeneration areas defined in the local development framework.
- 1c Percentage of 1a, by type, which is on previously developed land.
- 1d Employment land supply by type.
- 1e Losses of employment land in development/regeneration areas and local authority area.
- 1f Amount of employment land lost to residential development.

HOUSING

- 2a Housing trajectory showing:
 - net additional dwellings over the previous five year period or since the start of the relevant development plan document period, whichever is the longer;
 - net additional dwellings for the current year;
 - projected net additional dwellings up to the end of the relevant development plan document period or over a ten year period from its adoption, whichever is the longer;
 - (iv) the annual net additional dwelling requirement; and
 - (v) annual average number of net additional dwellings needed to meet overall housing requirements, having regard to previous years' performances.
 - 2b Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land.
 - 2c Percentage of new dwellings completed at:
 - less than 30 dwellings per hectare;
 - between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare; and
 - Above 50 dwellings per hectare.
 - 2d Affordable housing completions.
- For definitions and further explanation of what is required see Annex B.

TRANSPORT

- 3a Percentage of completed non-residential development complying with carparking standards set out in the local development framework.
- 3b Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre.

LOCAL SERVICES

- 4a Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development.
- 4b Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centres.
- 4c Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.

MINERALS (for minerals planning authority only)

- 5a Production of primary land won aggregates.
- 5b Production of secondary/recycled aggregates.

WASTE (for waste planning authority only)

- 6a Capacity of new waste management facilities by type.
- 6b Amount of municipal waste arising, and managed by management type, and the percentage each management type represents of the waste managed.

FLOOD PROTECTION AND WATER QUALITY

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>7. Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality.</p> <p>BIODIVERSITY 8. Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including: change in priority habitats and species (by type); and change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional or sub-regional significance.</p> <p>RENEWABLE ENERGY 9. Renewable energy capacity installed by type.</p> | |
| <p>Good Practise Guide on Planning for Tourism</p> | |
| <p>Outlines the economic significance of tourism and its environmental impact, and therefore its importance in land-use planning. It explains how the needs of tourism should be dealt with in development plans and in development control.</p> | <p>Not particularly relevant at this stage; consider during detailed DPD preparation.</p> |
| <p>REGIONAL</p> | |
| <p>East of England plan: Draft revision to the RSS for the East of England</p> | |
| <p>Objectives 1 increase prosperity and employment growth to meet identified employment needs of the region, and achieve a more sustainable balance between workers and jobs 2 improve social inclusion and access to employment and services and leisure and tourist facilities among those who are disadvantaged 3 maintain and enhance cultural diversity while addressing the distinctive needs of different parts of the region 4 increase the regeneration and renewal of disadvantaged areas 5 deliver more integrated patterns of land use, movement, activity and development, including employment and housing 6 sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres 7 make more use of previously developed land and existing buildings, and use land more efficiently, in meeting future development needs 8 meet the region's identified housing needs, and in particular provide sufficient affordable housing 9 protect and enhance the built and historic environment and encourage good quality design and use of sustainable construction methods for all new development 10 protect and enhance the natural environment, including its biodiversity and landscape character 11 minimise the demand for use of resources, particularly water, energy supplies, minerals, aggregates, and other natural resources, whether finite or renewable, by encouraging efficient use, re-use, or use of recycled alternatives, and trying to meet needs with minimum impact 12 minimise the environmental impact of travel, by reducing the need to travel, encouraging the use of more environmentally friendly modes of transport, and widening choice of modes 13 ensure that infrastructure programmes, whether for transport, utilities or social infrastructure, will meet current deficiencies and development requirements; and that the responsible agencies commit the resources needed to implement these programmes and co-ordinate delivery with development 14 minimise the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Indicators Draft RSS proposes 61 indicators.</p> | <p>Ensure that Hertsmere's SA objectives are consistent with the objectives for the emerging RSS.</p> |
| <p>East of England plan: Report of the Panel</p> | |
| <p>Suggests replacement of the fourteen objectives in the draft RSS with a revised set of five objectives: To reduce the region's impact on and exposure to the effects of climate change by: locating development so as to reduce the need to travel;</p> | <p>Ensure that Hertsmere's SA objectives are consistent with the objectives for the emerging RSS.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>effecting a major shift in travel towards public transport, walking and cycling and away from car use; maximising the energy efficiency of development and promoting renewable energy generation; and minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>To increase housing opportunities for people in the region by: securing a step change in the delivery of additional housing throughout the region, and especially in the Growth Areas; and recognising a priority for the provision of affordable housing to meet identified needs, particularly in rural areas.</p> <p>To realise the economic potential of the region and its people by: facilitating the development needed to support the region's business sectors and clusters and improvement of skills and the widening of opportunities in line with the Regional Economic Strategy; providing for job growth broadly to match increases in housing and to improve the alignment between workplaces and homes; maintaining and strengthening the region's inter-regional connections particularly by improving connections to economic opportunities in London; and ensuring adequate and sustainable provision of transport infrastructure.</p> <p>To improve the quality of life for the region's people by: ensuring new development fulfils the principles of sustainable communities, providing a well designed living environment adequately supported by social and green infrastructure; promoting social cohesion by improving access to work, services and other facilities especially for those who are disadvantaged; maintaining cultural diversity while addressing the distinctive needs of each part of the region; regeneration and renewal of disadvantaged areas; and increasing community involvement in the implementation of the strategy at the local level.</p> <p>To improve and conserve the region's environment by: ensuring the protection and enhancement of the region's environmental assets, including the built and historic environment, landscape and water; re-using previously developed land and seeking environmental as well as development gains from the use of previously undeveloped land; protecting and where appropriate enhancing biodiversity through the protection of habitats and species, and new habitat creation through development; provision of a network of multi-function greenspace accessible to the region's people; and minimising the demand for and use of water and other natural resources and reducing waste and increasing sustainable management of waste.</p> | |
| <p>East of England Plan: Secretary of State's proposed changes to RSS14</p> | |
| <p>This report confirms most of the findings in the Panel Report and in particular confirms the 5,000 housing target for Hertsmere. It included a number of substantial green belt reviews elsewhere in Hertfordshire (Hemel Hempstead and Welwyn Hatfield).</p> <p>In addition the level of growth proposed for the seven London arc districts in Hertfordshire has changed several times – from 55,800 new jobs in the draft Plan to 63,000 jobs in the Panel Report to 50,000 jobs in the Secretary of State's proposed changes.</p> | <p>Ensure that Hertsmere's SA objectives are consistent with the objectives for the emerging RSS.</p> |
| <p>East of England plan: Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> | |
| <p>Identifies baseline data and indicators and assesses sustainability of draft RSS.</p> <p>Objectives 1 achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.. Generate new jobs for people in the region? Encourage inward investment? Diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks? Encourage innovation? Increase manufacturing? Encourage new business start-ups? Support and encourage the growth of rural business? Provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants</p> | <p>Incorporate objectives and relevant indicators into local SA where appropriate</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living? Reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits? 2 (a) deliver more sustainable use of land Develop land with least environmental/amenity value / reduce vacant buildings and derelict land? Minimise the development of greenfield land. Minimise the development of land with the most environmental, agricultural and amenity value. Create attractive environment in built up areas? High quality of design: 'good enough to approve rather than bad enough to refuse'. Increase access to leisure facilities (inc. woodlands, parks)? Improve the quality & quantity of publicly accessible greenspace. Improve management of the impacts of access & recreation. Provide opportunities for people to come into contact with and appreciate wildlife & wild places. 2 (b) deliver more sustainable location patterns Minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change? Avoid development form being located in areas at risk from coastal and fluvial flooding or storm surges, taking into account climate change. No additional flood risk from new development. Reduce the need to travel? Reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycle, bus, train? Reduce need for air travel? Reduce traffic congestion? Reduce road freight movements? 3 protect and maintain vulnerable regional assets (natural, built & historic environment). Reduce any sources of pollution? Protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change? Avoid damage to designated sites (national and international) and protected species and achieve favourable condition. Maintain and enhance Biodiversity Action Plan habitats and species in line with regional targets. Restore the full range of characteristic habitats and species to viable levels. Protect and enhance the region's landscapes? Conserve & enhance AONBs & Broads Authority area. Conserve & enhance regional diversity and local distinctiveness. Recognise and protect historic landscape character. Maintain / enhance built and historic character? Ensure settlements can absorb growth without damage to character. Protect designated and undesignated (historic) sites and areas of significance. Limit water consumption to levels that continue to support wetland habitats (EN). Maintain extent of wetland habitat and rivers. Protect & enhance important coastal assets Improve the water quality of rivers and groundwater supplies. Maintain 'good' water quality whilst accommodating new development discharge. Achieve good air quality, especially in urban areas. 4 reduce greenhouse gas emissions Minimise need for energy? Increase energy efficiency? Increase renewable share of energy? Reduce need for car and road based freight transport? 5 share access to services and benefits of prosperity fairly Reduce disparities in income levels? Provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?</p> <p>Indicators BIODIVERSITY 1 Number and extent of designated sites 2 SSSI's containing fen vegetation 3 Extent of grassland habitat</p> | |
|--|--|

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| |
|---|
| 4 Implementation of BAPs |
| 5 % of SSSIs in good condition |
| 6 Decline in farmland bird species/population 1994-2002 |
| 7 Decline in woodland bird species/population |
| 8 BAP Natural areas |
| 9 Average woodland density |
| WATER QUALITY & RESOURCES |
| 10 Chemical river water quality |
| 11 Biological river water quality |
| 12 No. of nitrate vulnerable zones/Environmentally sensitive areas |
| 13 Area designated nitrogen Vulnerable zone |
| 14 Agri-env. / organic farming schemes |
| 15 Groundwater conditions |
| 16 Estuarine water quality |
| 17 Bathing water quality |
| 18 Abstraction rate of non-tidal water |
| 19 Reservoir volumes |
| 20 Average soil moisture deficit in mm |
| 21 No. of lakes and Reservoirs over 10ha 185 (Anglian), 10.4% of UK |
| 22 Water usage per capita |
| 23 Water leakage rate |
| SOIL QUALITY & RESOURCES |
| 24 Agricultural land resource (thousand hectares) |
| 25 Soil Quality |
| 26 Loss of greenfield land |
| 27 % land designated as Green Belt |
| 28 Houses affected by structural problems |
| 29 Amount of contaminated land 300,000 ha (estimate) |
| 30 Stock of vacant / brownfield land (2002) |
| 31 Construction industry key performance indicators |
| 32 % of housing built on brownfield sites |
| 33 Consumption of aggregates per capita |
| 34 Waste production by type (m tonnes) |
| 35 Total household waste (kg/person/year) |
| 36 Household waste recycled or composted (kg/person/year) |
| 37 % waste landfilled |
| 38 % waste recycled |
| 39 Waste production per capita per year |
| AIR QUALITY - OUTPUT FACTORS/EVIDENCE |
| 40 No. of moderate or poor air quality days 2003 |
| 41 Air Quality Management Areas |
| AIR QUALITY - CAUSAL FACTORS |
| 42 Modal split |
| 43 Modal split weighted by distance |
| 44 Commuting mode |

| | |
|--|--|
| 45 Mean journey to work time (minutes) | |
| 46 Mean journey to work time (minutes) | |
| 47 Road traffic growth 1993-2002. | |
| 48 Traffic (billion vehicle kilometres) | |
| 49 Road congestion | |
| 50 School journey mode | |
| 51 Bus availability | |
| 52 Bus use (kms/yr/capita) | |
| 53 Community transport schemes | |
| 54 Rail use (index based on use in 1995 = 100) | |
| 55 Private car ownership | |
| 56 Weekly household travel budget | |
| 57 Distance/income relationship | |
| 58 Road-building expenditure (2003) | |
| 59 Vehicles carried / day (thousands) | |
| 60 AM Peak traffic speed | |
| 61 PM Peak traffic speed | |
| 62 Off-peak traffic speed | |
| 63 Air Transport Movements (000s) | |
| CLIMATE CHANGE | |
| 64 River flood hazard (area affected) | |
| 65 Greenhouse gas emissions | |
| 66 CO2 Emissions per head (Kg Carbon) | |
| 67 Total CO2 Emissions million tonnes | |
| 68 Annual average rainfall | |
| 69 Energy consumption (overall / per capita) | |
| 70 Electricity / gas consumption GWh (2003) | |
| 71 % of energy from renewable sources | |
| 72 CHP (energy-efficient power generation) | |
| CULTURE, HERITAGE, LANDSCAPE & ACCESS | |
| 73 Landscape character | |
| 74 National Parks | |
| 75 Areas of Outstanding Natural beauty | |
| 76 Length of designated heritage coast | |
| 77 % of landscape classed as tranquil | |
| 78 Accessibility/condition of rights of way | |
| 79 Severance (habitats and/or communities) | |
| 80 % of pop. living within 200m of open space | |
| 81 Development pressure | |
| 82 % of listed sites at risk | |
| 83 Buildings at risk | |
| 84 Condition of Ancient Monuments RENS.pdf | |
| 85 Light Pollution Growth- % of night skies with 'truly dark skies' or 'reasonably dark skies' 2000 (1993) | |
| POPULATION, HUMAN HEALTH & CRIME | |
| 86 Age distribution | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| 87 Rural population | |
| 88 Household growth | |
| 89 Population growth | |
| 90 Population density (persons / ha) | |
| 91 Housing density (Houses / ha) | |
| 92 People per household | |
| 93 General level of health | |
| 94 Provision of unpaid care | |
| 95 Life expectancy | |
| 96 Standardised Mortality ratio | |
| 97 Exercise levels | |
| 98 % of population who smoke Household expenditure a week on tobacco and alcohol (2003) | |
| 99 Incidence of crime (vehicle-related only) per 100,000 population | |
| 100 Incidence of crime (Burglary in a dwelling only) per 100,000 population | |
| 101 Incidence of crime (Robbery only) per 100,000 population | |
| 102 Violence against the person | |
| 103 Offences committed on railway system | |
| 104 Fear of crime | |
| 105 Noise nuisance | |
| 106 Road accidents | |
| 107 Breath test ratio | |
| MATERIAL ASSETS | |
| 108 No. of vacant properties | |
| 109 Building functionality / quality / visual impact | |
| 110 Access to services (general) | |
| 111 Rural service deprivation | |
| 112 Community vibrancy | |
| 113 Property values (£000s) | |
| 114 Rural:urban population ratio | |
| SOCIAL INCLUSION | |
| 115 % pop. in homes with no wage earner | |
| 116 % of working age people without qualifications 1 | |
| 117 % of children living in households with relative low income (below 60 per cent of contemporary median) | |
| 118 % of all households experiencing fuel poverty (2001 figures) | |
| 119 % earning close to the minimum wage | |
| 120 % of pop. living in affordable housing | |
| 121 % Dwellings not meeting the 'Decent Homes' standard | |
| 122 Poor quality housing | |
| 123 Elderly experiencing fuel poverty | |
| 124 % of pop. who are homeless | |
| 125 Tenant participation | |
| 126 Index of multiple deprivation | |
| ECONOMIC ACTIVITY | |
| 127 GDP £ per head | |
| 128 Gross Value Added £ per head | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>129 Employment level 130 Unemployment level 131 Unemployed benefit claimants 132 % of working age people in work in May - July 133 Average weekly earnings 134 Disposable household income per capita 135 New businesses surviving 3 years 136 % mfg investment from abroad 137 % of economically active population with NVQ3 or higher qualifications 138 % of people at 19 with NVQ2 or higher qualifications</p> | |
| <p>Our Environment, Our Future: The Regional Environmental Strategy for the East of England (July 2003)</p> <p>Strategic aims SA1 Accommodate population and economic growth whilst protecting and enhancing the environment SA2 Reduce the need to travel and achieve a switch to more sustainable modes of transport SA3 Deliver sustainable design SA4 Reduce vulnerability of the region to climate change SA5 Promote energy conservation and a switch to renewable energy sources SA6 Harness environmental benefits arising from climate change SA7 Improve the environmental awareness, skills, and housekeeping of business and the workforce SA8 Promote the environmental economy SA9 Deliver more sustainable agriculture SA10 Maintain and strengthen landscape and townscape character SA11 Enhance biodiversity SA12 Conserve and enhance the historic environment SA13 Reduce the region's global environmental impact SA14 Increase understanding and ownership of environmental issues</p> | <p>Incorporate objectives and relevant indicators into local SA where appropriate</p> |
| <p>Revised Regional Housing Strategy for the East of England 2005-2010</p> <p>Vision To ensure everyone can live in a decent home at a price they can afford in locations that are sustainable.</p> <p>Aims Use housing investment to support economic development and ensure that the capacity of the housing sector can deliver Provide a sustainable environment and attractive places to live Promote social inclusion within sustainable communities Ensure that housing serves to improve the region's health and well-being and reduce inequalities</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>A Shared Vision: The regional economic strategy for the East of England (2004)</p> <p>Vision A leading economy, founded on a world-class knowledge base and the creativity and enterprise of our people, in order to improve the quality of life of all who live and work here.</p> <p>Key strategic goals</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>A skills base that can support a world-class economy Growing competitiveness, productivity and entrepreneurship Global leadership in developing and realising innovation in science High quality places to live, work and visit Social exclusion and broad participation in the regional economy Making the most from the development of international gateways and national and regional transport corridors A leading information society An exemplar for the efficient use of resources.</p> | |
| <p>A Housing Strategy for the London Commuter Belt 2005-2008</p> <p>Vision To enable growth in the sub-region and to provide for the needs of homeless people and those who require affordable housing, whilst protecting the environment To create and maintain sustainable communities and achieve social inclusion; and To make the best use of stock whilst improving its condition in both the public and private sectors.</p> <p>Priorities Maximising the delivery of affordable housing Developing the intermediate market Improving stock condition Meeting the needs of vulnerable groups Achieving social inclusion</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Sustainable Futures: The Integrated Regional Strategy for the East of England</p> <p>Vision To improve the quality of life for everyone who lives or works in the East of England</p> <p>Objectives An exceptional knowledge base and a dynamic economy in the Region; Opportunities for everyone to contribute to – and benefit from – the Region’s economic dynamism; Strong, inclusive, healthy and culturally rich communities; A high quality and diverse natural and built environment; And A more resource-efficient region.</p> <p>The strategy also identifies eight “Crucial Regional Issues”: Housing supply, growth and sustainability; Transport, travel and infrastructure; Building the knowledge economy; Skills and labour supply; Deprivation and access to services Health and well being; Rural issues; and Resource issues</p> | <p>The strategy covers a wide range of themes which will be incorporated into SA Objectives and targets as appropriate.</p> |
| <p>A Sustainable Development Framework for the East of England</p> <p>Vision To plan for an improving quality of life for the people of the East of England which is sustainable for the long-term future and, in particular: Enable its potential for economic growth to be achieved in a balanced way, in the interests of all the people of the region and the UK and beyond.</p> | <p>To be incorporated into SA Objectives</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Spread the benefits of growth more equally, so as to reduce poverty, crime, ill health and social exclusion and reduce inequalities. Foster a sense of well-being and self-worth by enabling people to achieve their full potential, and providing for rewarding employment, learning and leisure. Protect and enhance the quality of the region's natural and built environment. Manage the use of resources sustainably and innovatively, in order to minimise the region's global environmental impact.</p> <p>Objectives To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth. To deliver more sustainable patterns of location of development, including employment and housing. To protect and maintain our most valuable regional assets such as designated habitats, landscapes of natural beauty, and our historic built heritage, and to improve the wider environment by means of adequate investment and management. To reduce our consumption of fossil fuels. To achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas in the region. To use natural resources, both finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible, and re-use finite resources or recycled alternatives wherever possible. To minimise our production of by-products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible. To avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life (e.g. dependence on unsustainably produced and/or transported food imports or timber). To revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living.</p> | |
| <p>Regional Social Strategy: A Strategy to achieve a fair and inclusive society</p> | |
| <p>Vision To achieve social inclusion throughout the East of England</p> <p>Aims To develop a common definition of social exclusion, analyse its causes and describe how it is experienced. To bring together the evidence for effective intervention at a regional and local level in order to add value. To focus regional action in tackling social exclusion. To provide a framework for supporting regional and local action for tackling social exclusion.</p> <p>Objectives To tackle poverty and reduce income inequalities To promote access to work, tackle low pay and improve conditions of work To improve the life chances of children from disadvantaged families and support vulnerable young people in the transition to adulthood To improve the life chances of adults through learning and skills development To promote active ageing and reduce social exclusion of older people To support the development of sustainable communities To improve access to services, especially for disadvantaged groups To develop social networks, community assets and promote community cohesion</p> | <p>Incorporate into SA Objectives and indicators</p> |
| <p>Living with climate change in the East of England</p> | |
| <p>Identifies a number of key messages: By planning ahead we can avoid the worst impacts and take advantage of any opportunities. Investing now to adapt to climate change can lead to cost savings in the future. Key stakeholders in the East of England favour adopting an approach to climate change which allows the region to live with the impacts of climate change in the long term, rather than fight against them in the short term. Climate change will create opportunities as well as threats. Tourism is one of the most obvious beneficiaries, but other sectors may also benefit, e.g.</p> | <p>Impact upon climate change will be considered in the SA</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>environmental technologies to deal with the impacts of climate change. Though very few business sectors consider climate change adaptation to be important, business activity will be significantly affected by changes in climate. For the Southern Heartland flood risk and water resource issues will be significant. Development will undoubtedly continue in areas more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, often for good reasons; the guiding principles prepared as part of the study can help to optimise their location and reduce the vulnerability of settlements to climate change.</p> | |
| <p>Creating Sustainable Communities in the East of England</p> | |
| <p>Regional level companion to the Sustainable Communities plan, identifies a number of strategic challenges for the region: Addressing problems of high and rapidly rising house prices and their impact on the recruitment and retention of staff, particularly close to London and around Cambridge but spreading deeper into the region. Improving transport infrastructure – railways, roads, airports and ports to meet the needs of economic growth. Ensuring that the benefits of economic growth are spread across the region, particularly to those urban and rural communities facing problems of deprivation and peripherality. Addressing the development consequences of scarce water resources throughout the region and an increasing sea level for coastal and low lying areas.</p> | <p>To be incorporated into sustainability objectives and key issues</p> |
| <p>Towns and Cities – Strategy and Action Plan: Urban Renaissance</p> | |
| <p>Regional level response to the Urban White Paper and Sustainable Communities plan. Shares the vision and objectives of its higher level counterpart with an additional objective: People and organisations in the public, private and voluntary sectors who have the skills necessary to deliver the urban renaissance.</p> <p>Report also identifies a number of headline targets: To focus development on previously developed land To develop housing at higher densities where there is good public transport accessibility To focus development on the main urban areas To stabilise car traffic in major urban areas To focus retail provision in the centre of urban areas</p> | <p>To be incorporated into SA Objectives</p> |
| <p>COUNTY</p> | |
| <p>Hertfordshire Structure Plan 1991-2011</p> | |
| <p>Aims for sustainability Reduce overall demand for resources Make the most efficient use, including re-use and recycling, of renewable and non-renewable resources (including land) Increase the use of renewable resources where this would not be detrimental to other aims Maintain and enhance biological diversity Mitigate the possible causes and effects of climate change Increase the rate of carbon fixing Reduce pollution and the effects it has on ecosystems and human health Maintain 'critical' national and local environmental assets, which would be impossible or very difficult to replace Maintain and where possible increase stocks of less critical environmental assets (of which no one example is critical but whose overall spread and frequency are important for the environmental character of an area) Improve the overall quality of life, meeting housing, employment, health, education, recreation and other human needs within a safe, healthy, diverse and pleasant environment Increase community awareness and involvement Improve equality of opportunity in economic and social terms Apply the precautionary principle where the potential damage to the environment is uncertain and significant.</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Hertfordshire Structure Plan Alterations 2001-2016 Deposit Draft Version, February 2003</p> | |
| <p>Key issues Making development more sustainable, for example through location, high quality design and construction Meeting an annual average building rate of 3,280 homes Concentrating new house building within existing built up areas, with at least 60 per cent on previously developed land Developing land efficiently Maintaining the vitality and viability of existing towns and villages Encouraging continued economic growth consistent with the number of people seeking work and environmental constraints Encouraging key businesses within the county, for example, the film industry and life science research Taking advantage of the economic and transport opportunities afforded by Luton and Stansted airports whilst safeguarding the quality of life of people who live and work in the county Providing a larger proportion of new housing that is affordable to people on lower incomes, and ensuring that key workers, such as teachers and health staff, can afford to live in the county Reducing road traffic growth, particularly in main towns and at peak periods, and encouraging walking, cycling and greater use of passenger transport in preference to the private car Conserving and enhancing the county's important environmental assets, including its landscape, ecological, built and archaeological heritage and safeguarding the county's area of green belt Encouraging the integration of renewable sources of energy into new development Promoting the re-use and recycling of waste and the conservation of water resources</p> <p>Requires Hertsmere to provide for 250 new dwellings per annum from 2003 to 2011.</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan 2006/07 to 2010/11</p> <p>Vision To provide a safe, efficient and affordable transport system that allows access for all to everyday facilities. Everyone will have the opportunity and information to choose the most appropriate form of transport and time of travel. By maximising the use of the existing capacity of the network we will work towards a transport system that balances economic prosperity with personal health and environmental well being.</p> <p>Key objectives Safety To improve safety for all by giving the highest priority to minimising the number of collisions and injuries occurring as a result of the transport system. Congestion To obtain the best use of the existing network through effective design, maintenance and management. To manage the growth of transport and travel volumes across the county, and thereby secure improvements in the predictability of travel time. To develop an efficient, safe, affordable and enhanced transport system which is attractive, reliable, integrated and makes best use of resources. Accessibility To develop a transport system that provides access to employment, shopping, education, leisure and health facilities for all, including those without a car and those with impaired mobility. To ensure that the transport system contributes towards improving the efficiency of commerce and industry and the provision of sustainable economic development in appropriate locations. Environmental To mitigate the effect of the transport system on the built and natural environment and on personal health. To raise awareness and encourage use of more sustainable modes of transport through effective promotion, publicity, information and education.</p> | <p>The SA will include objectives on the reduction of traffic, improvements to air quality, human health, and the reduction in crime.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Other To reduce the need for the movement of people and goods through integrated land use planning, the promotion of sustainable distribution and the use of telecommunications.</p> | |
| <p>Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan 2006/07 – 2010/11 Strategic Environmental Assessment Report</p> <p>SEA Objectives Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment Improve economic performance and competitiveness consistent with environmental constraints Create a vibrant local economy Maintain high and stable levels of employment Promote lifelong learning and skills development Maintain the vitality and viability of existing centres Social progress which meets the needs of everyone Tackle the causes of poverty and social exclusion Improve physical and mental health of population and reduce health inequalities Ensure everyone has the opportunity for a decent home Reduce crime and create safe environments Maximise the opportunities for leisure and a healthy lifestyle for all Spread economic growth more evenly to benefit deprived areas Improve access to services and community facilities for all Empower all sections of the community to participate in decision making and local action Effective protection of the environment and prudent use of natural resources Adhere to environmental standards and management principles Improve the sustainable use of resources Reduce pollution Ensure the sustainable supply and use of energy Move away from waste disposal to minimisation, reuse, recycling and recovery Ensure the efficient use of water and safeguard water resources Plan for the impacts of climate change Protect and enhance biodiversity Protect and provide green spaces Ensure the efficient use of land and buildings Protect landscape and townscape character Improve the choice of sustainable transport modes, encourage their use, and reduce the need to travel by car</p> | <p>SA objectives generally include improving air quality, promoting better health and reducing the need to travel and accessibility. Incorporate in SA objectives wherever appropriate</p> |
| <p>Hertfordshire Accessibility Planning Strategy 2006/07 – 2010/11</p> <p>Vision To improve access opportunities to the key services of health, learning, work, food shopping and leisure by public transport, walking and cycling</p> <p>Objectives To support those who are disadvantaged to achieve their potential and to access sustainable employment To work in partnership with transport providers to achieve an efficient, affordable and enhanced transport system To develop a transport system that provides access to employment, shopping, education, leisure and health facilities for all, including those without a car and those with impaired mobility</p> | <p>The Strategy is linked to a number of key SA topic areas aimed at reducing the need to travel and improving accessibility to key facilities. Incorporate into SA wherever possible.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Indicators % of a) pupils of compulsory school age (*); b) pupils of compulsory school age in receipt of free school meals within 15 and 30 minutes of a primary school and 20 and 40 minutes of a secondary school by public transport % of 16-19 year olds within 30 and 60 minutes of a further education establishment by public transport % of a) people of working age (16-74); b) people in receipt of Jobseekers' allowance within 20 and 40 minutes of work by public transport % of a) households b) households without access to a car within 30 and 60 minutes of a hospital(**) by public transport % of a) households b) households without access to a car within 15 and 30 minutes of a GP by public transport % of a) households; b) households without access to a car within 15 and 30 minutes of a major centre by public transport</p> | |
| <p>Hertfordshire Economic Development Strategy 2006-2010 Objectives reflect those in the Regional Economic Strategy: A skills base that can support a world-class economy Growing competitiveness, productivity and entrepreneurship Global leadership in developing and realising innovation in science High quality places to live, work and visit Social exclusion and broad participation in the regional economy Making the most from the development of international gateways and national and regional transport corridors A leading information society An exemplar for the efficient use of resources.</p> | <p>The SA/ SA will include information and objectives based on increasing economic efficiency, accessibility and social inclusion, encouragement of skills and knowledge and creation of sustainable buildings</p> |
| <p>A community strategy for Hertfordshire 2004/10 To improve the well being of the people of Hertfordshire, today and for future generations</p> <p>Key Themes and Aims Building a prosperous, inclusive society: Develop an economic and social environment that supports the development of businesses Improve standards of living in a sustainable manner Develop an economy that is prosperous, socially inclusive and environmentally sensitive Creating safer communities: Ensure that Hertfordshire continues to be a safe place in which to live, work and travel Break the cycle of offending and break the cycle of people becoming victims Protect vulnerable members of the community from committing crime or becoming victims of crime Reduce the impact that drugs misuse and alcohol misuse has on communities Investing in children and young people: Ensure that children and young people in the county are protected from harm and helped to realize their potential Increase learning, play, and leisure opportunities and promotion of healthy lifestyles for children and young people, thus improving their life chances as the adults of the future Ensure that children and young people have equal opportunities for development and achievement Take forward the Preventative Strategy to ensure that children and young people receive effective help as soon as they need it Further develop joint planning and commissioning arrangements to promote co-operation to improve the wellbeing of all children Maintaining a sustainable environment: Work towards a more sustainable environment Protect and enhance natural assets Provide appropriate transport provision and more affordable and sustainable homes Promoting healthier communities: Tackle the root causes of ill health to secure the well being of future generations</p> | <p>Relates to many of the objectives including reduction of crime, promoting skills, economic growth, affordable homes, accessibility and social inclusion</p> |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <p>Reduce inequalities in health and improve lifestyle risk factors Improve the health of vulnerable people</p> | |
| <p>The Hertfordshire Environmental Strategy (2001)</p> | |
| <p>Sustainability principles for Hertfordshire:</p> <p>A better quality of life The creation of a better quality of life for every body that lives and works within the County lies at the heart of the sustainable development strategy for Hertfordshire. It is the starting point and it is from this objective that the other five take their lead. We will work toward the ideas of sustainable development by integrating into everything we do an appropriate balance of environmental, social and economic considerations. In all of our decisions, we will take a long-term view of the consequences and the impact on future generations.</p> <p>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone Everyone should share in the benefits of increased prosperity surrounded by a clean and safe environment. We have to improve access to services, tackle social exclusion, and reduce the harm to health caused by poverty, poor housing, unemployment and pollution. Our needs must not be met by treating others, including future generations and people elsewhere in the world, unfairly. We will try to make sure that everyone has equal access to the services and information necessary to make responsible environmental choices and improve their life chances. We will work in partnership to reduce crime and the fear of crime in Hertfordshire. We will respect and value all the different cultures represented in the County. We will help raise people's awareness of the benefits of healthier lifestyles. We will co-ordinate our activities with other organisations and work in partnership when it makes sense to do so. We will encourage people to get involved in their local communities, to understand the needs of all groups in those communities and to recognise the value of group action. We will work with the community, taking notice of people's opinions, ideas and concerns, and giving them influence over actions that affect them.</p> <p>Effective protection of the environment We must act to limit global environmental threats such as climate change; to protect human health and safety from hazards such as poor air quality and toxic chemicals; and to protect things which people need or value, such as wildlife, landscapes and historic buildings. We will start by complying with the minimum requirements of the law and other environmental regulations, and strive for year on year improvement. We will try to make sure that any new development adopts the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) in its construction and continued use. Before taking decisions involving new science and technology we will examine the available evidence to assess its possible impact on the environment, applying the Precautionary Principle when appropriate. In everything we do, we will consider the impact on wildlife of Hertfordshire, and try to keep and improve habitats where wildlife can prosper. We will take immediate action against those who wilfully break the law and cause damage to the environment.</p> <p>Prudent use of natural resources This does not mean denying ourselves the use of non-renewable resources such as oil and gas, but we do need to make sure that we use them efficiently and that alternatives are developed to replace them in due course. Renewable resources such as water should be used in ways that do not endanger the resource or cause serious damage or pollution. We will try to carry out our own activities in a way that minimises our use of non-renewable resources and ensure that we use all resources in an efficient and responsible way. We will make it as easy as possible for everyone to chose the form of transport appropriate to his or her journey that has least cost for the environment. We will try to make sure our own service are fully accessible without using private cars...</p> | <p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Maintenance of high levels of economic growth and employment so that everyone can share in high living standards and greater job opportunities The UK is a trading nation in a rapidly changing world. For our country to prosper, our businesses must produce the high quality goods and services that consumers throughout the world want, at prices they are prepared to pay. To achieve this we need a workforce that is equipped with the education and skills for the 21st century. In addition, we need businesses ready to invest in Hertfordshire, and an infrastructure to support them. We will contribute to a strong, sustainable economy for Hertfordshire, providing a variety of jobs and training opportunities for local people, and wherever possible, investing locally. We will try to meet as many as possible of Hertfordshire people's leisure needs locally, without overloading the places that provide the opportunities.</p> <p>Effective communications of ideas and information Only by acting together can these objectives be realised, therefore communication is essential to the realisation of this strategy. This must be open and effective between the many public sector bodies to whom responsibility for the implementation of this strategy will fall. It must also be effective in translating the ideas, actions and achievements to the public; they are a crucial element in taking forward the strategy if implementation is to be successful We will encourage those working for us and for us to adopt these Principles and implement them. We will provide clear and open information on the work that we carry out. These areas correspond with the four objectives identified in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 'A better quality of life'. The remaining two objectives are specific to Hertfordshire and are a result of the consultation process carried out to identify the principles.</p> | |
| <p>Hertfordshire Waste Strategy 2002-2024</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate the provision of sufficient waste management facilities in Hertfordshire to accommodate the equivalent of the County's own arisings; To recognise that waste management generates employment and is part of the infrastructure which supports business in general; To locate waste recycling, handling and reduction facilities as close as practicable to the origin of waste; To promote the development of waste management facilities which increase the proportion of waste managed further up the waste hierarchy; To minimise the traffic generating effects of waste management development; To mitigate against the possible effects of greenhouse gases; To reduce the overall demand for resources (including land); To involve the wider community in the waste management debate; To facilitate the increased use of recycled waste materials as aggregate in Hertfordshire; To facilitate a shift away from road transport as the principal means of transporting waste; To minimise the impact of waste management development on the natural and built environment; To maximise the recovery of value (including energy) from waste, where this represents the Best Practicable Environmental Option; To adopt the Best Practicable Environmental Option when considering alternative forms of waste management development. | <p>Encouraging better waste management will help to achieve SA objectives encouraging sustainable waste management</p> |
| <p>Waste Development Plan Issues and Options Paper September 2004</p> <p>As objectives for Hertfordshire Waste Strategy 2002-2024 plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce and minimise the amount waste produced for disposal, including through industry operations (e.g. packaging) To involve the wider community in the waste management debate | <p>Encouraging better waste management will help to achieve SA objectives encouraging sustainable waste management</p> |
| <p>Draft SEA Scoping Report for Hertfordshire's Municipal Waste Management Strategy</p> <p>Unable to obtain document</p> | |
| <p>Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan Second Deposit Draft 2003</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To encourage the efficient use of materials, particularly maximising the use of recycled and secondary aggregates and reducing the use of primary aggregates, thereby reducing reliance on land won sources of material. To identify and safeguard mineral resources to ensure that there are sufficient environmentally acceptable sources to maintain an appropriate level of current and future supply in accordance with Government guidance and to prevent the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources. To ensure that the adverse impacts on the environment and people caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are kept, as far as possible, to an acceptable minimum. To ensure sensitive working, reclamation and aftercare practices so as to preserve or enhance the overall quality of the environment and promote | <p>Encouraging efficient resource use and environmental preservation to be reflected in SA objectives</p> |

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| biodiversity where appropriate. | |
| Enjoy! A cultural strategy for Hertfordshire 2002-2007 | |
| <p>Key messages</p> <p>Making Hertfordshire a more prosperous and attractive place to live, work or visit</p> <p>Offering children, young people and adults the opportunity to reach their full potential through access to learning and information</p> <p>Encouraging children and young people to access and enjoy cultural and leisure activities</p> <p>Enabling all members of the community to have more and easier access to different cultural and leisure pursuits</p> <p>Valuing and supporting the diverse range of cultural and leisure activities enjoyed across the county</p> <p>Working in partnership with national, regional and local agencies to deliver a range of cultural and leisure activities effectively</p> | Incorporate in SA objectives |
| A 50 Year Vision for the Wildlife and Natural Habitats of Hertfordshire | |
| <p>The 50 Year Vision, forms one component of a suite of strategies being developed for Hertfordshire, through the umbrella Hertfordshire Countryside Strategy. It aims:</p> <p>To establish a plan partnership through identifying and consulting key partners in the process.</p> <p>To produce an overview of our present knowledge of the biodiversity resource in the county.</p> <p>To prepare a series of prioritised habitat action plans to guide work on protecting, restoring and re-creating a sustainable level of biodiversity in the county. Within each habitat action plan to identify detailed targets reflecting both national and local importance for the first ten years.</p> <p>To identify a list of priority species for the preparation of action plans. Concise target statements should be prepared for all chosen species.</p> <p>Within each habitat and species action plan to identify delivery mechanisms and sources of finance and advice.</p> <p>To publish the plan and implement the agreed programme of action.</p> <p>To establish a long term monitoring programme to measure the effectiveness of the Plan in achieving national and local targets.</p> <p>Action plans Have been prepared for the following species:</p> <p>Water Vole</p> <p>Common Dormouse</p> <p>Natterer's Bat</p> <p>Otter</p> <p>Tree Sparrow</p> <p>Bittern</p> <p>Stone Curlew</p> <p>Song Thrush</p> <p>Great Crested Newt</p> <p>Chalkhill Blue</p> <p>Grizzled Skipper</p> <p>Stag Beetle</p> <p>White-clawed Crayfish</p> <p>Great Pignut</p> <p>Cornflower</p> <p>River Water-dropwort</p> <p>Pasqueflower</p> | Incorporate in SA objectives |
| LOCAL | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Hertsmere Together Community Strategy First Review 2006-2020</p> | |
| <p>Aims & objectives Create a safer environment To reduce crime: prioritising vehicle crime, burglary, domestic violence, race hate and crimes of local concern. To reduce anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related disorder. To reduce harm caused to communities by drugs. To build community confidence and reduce fear of crime levels. Improve and sustain the quality of Hertsmere's environment To improve road safety and obtain the best use of the existing highways network through effective design, maintenance and management. To ensure waste is sustainably managed. To ensure neighbourhoods and public spaces are cleaner and greener, and communities take an active role in managing their own environment. To protect and enhance the natural and built environment. Promote healthier communities and leisure and cultural opportunities To improve opportunities for people to engage in a healthy, active lifestyle through the development of facilities, activities and cultural opportunities. To meet NHS targets of numbers of four week quitters who have accessed the NHS stop smoking service and increase the number of premises where a no smoking policy is active in all buildings and grounds. To increase the number of 5 to 16 year olds who spend a minimum of 2 hours each week on physical recreation or school sports. To increase the number of people who carry out voluntary work in sport or leisure based clubs. Encourage economic development, lifelong learning, employment and regeneration opportunities To ensure local residents have the skills to enable them to compete in the labour market. To increase entrepreneurial activity amongst the local population. To assist the growth and retention of existing businesses and the development of a self-sustaining local economy. To support appropriate inward investment and infrastructure improvements. To support and implement actions which will assist community development and capacity building. Work towards meeting local housing needs To optimise the supply of affordable housing. To improve domestic energy efficiency and reduce fuel poverty. To improve conditions in the private rented sector. To achieve the Decent Homes Standard in social housing by 2010.</p> | <p>Objectives developed at the local level following consultation process. Hertsmere's SA objectives and indicators should closely align with those set out in the Community Strategy.</p> |
| <p>Hertsmere Local Plan (2003)</p> | |
| <p>Objectives for sustainable development Minimise as far as possible the growth in demand for resources (including land and water); Make the most efficient use of non-renewable resources (including land); Increase, where possible, the use of renewable resources where there is unused capacity and an increase in use will not be detrimental to other aims; Increase the reuse and recycling of resources; Maintain and enhance biological diversity; Seek to reduce the adverse impact of transport; Increase the rate of 'carbon fixing'; Reduce and prevent pollution and the effects it has on ecosystems and human health; Maintain and enhance the capacity of the natural environment to renew itself; Maintain critical national and local assets which would be impossible or very difficult to replace (such as important habitats, local nature reserves, nature conservation sites and historic buildings); Maintain and enhance stocks of less critical assets and environmental quality (of which no one example is critical but whose overall spread and frequency</p> | <p>Contains existing objectives for sustainable development. Review in context of recent plans and policies, and incorporate as appropriate into SA for new LDF.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>are important for the environmental character and quality of an area) e.g. Conservation areas; Improve the overall quality of life to provide a safe, healthy, diverse and pleasant environment; Ensure that people's fundamental needs for shelter and economic means of support are met; Increase community awareness and involvement; Improve equality of opportunity in economic and social terms; Have regard to the precautionary principle where the potential damage to the environment is uncertain and significant.</p> <p>Plan objectives Maintain the settlement pattern of small to medium sized towns and viable village communities and maintain and protect the Green Belt throughout the Borough; Concentrate development in towns, through the reuse of previously developed sites, subject to ensuring that this does not adversely affect the quality of their environments; Make provision for around 4,600 additional homes between 1991 and 2011; Ensure that the community's need for affordable housing is provided for within the constraints of the planning system; Make provision for the employment needs of the population and encourage commercial development in appropriate locations; Reduce the adverse effects of movement by guiding development to locations which reduce the need to travel, or are accessible by a variety of modes of transport; Protect existing plant cover (particularly trees) and seek to increase it; Protect critical natural habitats and the green corridors linking them together and aim to create new habitats; Protect and enhance critical built assets; Protect and enhance the water environment; Maximise the benefits from, and minimise the environmental damage caused by, waste; Sustain and enhance the Borough's town and district centres; Allow for improvements to sport, leisure and recreational facilities; Allow for improvements to health, educational, cultural and other facilities; Maintain and, where possible, improve the quality of design and encourage secure and accessible environments.</p> | |
| <p>Smile - a cultural and leisure strategy for Hertsmere</p> | |
| <p>Create a safer environment by appropriate development of cultural activities Improve and sustain the quality of Hertsmere's cultural environment Promote cultural opportunities to address health inequalities Through the development of cultural services encourage economic development and regeneration Encourage lifelong learning opportunities Improve access to cultural services and address inequalities</p> | <p>Improving access to cultural and leisure opportunities could form a SA objective</p> |
| <p>Hertsmere Contaminated Land Strategy</p> | |
| <p>Provides a framework for identifying contamination risks and procedures for dealing with contaminated land, encouraging it to be brought back into use. Reflects relevant legislative aims to: to identify and remove unacceptable risks to human health and the environment; to seek to bring damaged land back into beneficial use; and to seek to ensure that the cost burdens faced by individuals, companies and society as a whole are proportionate, manageable and economically sustainable.</p> | <p>Encouraging more effective pollution control could meet a number of SA objectives relating to health and well being, promoting more sustainable development and reducing land (as well as air and water)</p> |
| <p>Draft Corporate Plan 2006-2009</p> | |
| <p>Relevant objectives: Build community confidence and further reduce the fear of crime</p> | <p>Relates to many of the objectives including reduction of crime, promoting skills, economic</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Protect and enhance the natural environment Protect and enhance the built environment Improve waste minimisation in the Borough Reduce environmental nuisance Improve on the range of recreational facilities and activities for our residents Promote and create opportunities for residents to engage in a healthy lifestyle Sustain existing economic prosperity in the Borough Target initiatives to address social and economic inequalities in the Borough Optimise the supply of affordable housing Improve domestic energy efficiency and reduce fuel poverty</p> | <p>growth, affordable homes, accessibility and social inclusion</p> |
| <p>Crime, disorder and drugs reduction strategy for Hertsmere Reduce crime by targeting: vehicle crime domestic burglary domestic violence and race hate crimes of local concern Reduce anti-social behaviour and alcohol-related disorder Reduce harm caused to communities by drugs Build community confidence and reduce fear of crime levels</p> | <p>Relates specifically to objectives which seek promotion of healthy and safe living and reduction in anti-social behaviour</p> |
| <p>Hertsmere Housing Strategy 2004-2007 Sets out the Council's strategy for dealing with housing needs, the homeless, Council housing, people with special needs etc. Updates and replaces the 2000-2003 Housing Strategy. Identifies eight priorities Secure the provision of additional affordable housing for the Borough Use partnership working to continue to develop an effective and fit for purpose housing strategy for Hertsmere, and to improve engagement of housing service providers in delivering Hertsmere's Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy Continue to improve efficiency and effectiveness of services to homeless people Improve provision and co-ordination of housing advice and homeless prevention Develop and implement a robust Private Sector Housing Strategy Review the effectiveness of the Housing Register and nominations rights to housing associations Ensure issues of equal opportunity within the provision of housing in Hertsmere are effectively addressed, particularly for minority ethnic and faith populations Maximise the opportunity of information technology</p> | <p>Housing is key issue to be addressed through SA objectives; overall objectives of Hertsmere Housing Strategy need to be reflected in SA objectives</p> |
| <p>Hertsmere Supplementary Planning Guidance: Monitoring and Review – Sustainability Indicators (2003) 1A. (BVPI 106) The percentage of new homes built on previously developed land: Headline Indicator 1B. Number of development proposals which reuse contaminated land 1C. (HEF) Land used for 'urban activities' (defined as urban land developed for any purpose, including housing, industry / commerce, etc.) 2A. (HEF) Overall number of Wildlife Sites 2B. (PUSP) Number of Wildlife Sites with positive management in place 3A. (HEF) Volume of motor traffic (million vehicle kilometres per day): Headline Indicator 3B (i). (HEF) 'Modal split' (the choice of transport form used) – General Users 3B (ii) (HCC) Modal Split for Travel to School 3C. (WCCF, 3) Creation or re-opening of good quality, non car routes (cycle routes, 'Greenways', etc.)</p> | <p>Current set of local sustainability indicators. Update in context of other recent plans/policies and include in new SA where appropriate.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>4A. (WCCF, 1) Creation of well-designed woodland in the Forest area 4B. (PUSP) Number of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's) revised or re-served annually 5A. (HEF) Nitrogen Dioxide levels: Headline Indicator 6A. Number of Listed Buildings (of each grade) de-listed or on 'At Risk' register: Headline Indicator 6B. Number of statutory nature conservation sites (SSSI's, LNR's etc.): Headline Indicator 7A. (PUSP) Number of new or revised Conservation Areas designated annually 8A. (BVPI 82a) Total tonnage of household waste arisings: percentage recycled: Headline Indicator 9A. Number of households in housing need: Headline Indicator 9B. Percentage of affordable housing units completed each year (delivered through the planning process) as a percentage of all completions 9C. Number of overall annual housing completions 10A. Number of people (registered as) unemployed: Headline Indicator 10B. Number of businesses in Hertsmere 11A. Number of open spaces / play areas provided or improved through the planning process 12A. Number of people registered with an interest on the Local Plan database 12B. Number of people registered on the SPG consultation list 13A. Bi-annual 'health check' of the Borough's town centres (using basic measures) 13B. Number of vacant shop units in each town centre 14A. (BVPI 125) Total recorded crimes per 1,000 population and percentage detected 14B. Number of annual consultations carried out on planning applications with the Police Architectural Liaison Officer 14C. Comparison of crime rates between developments endorsed through the 'Secured by Design' process and those without it</p> | |
| <p>Hertsmere Air Quality Review</p> <p>Reviews the achievement of air quality objectives in Hertsmere for a range of identified pollutants. Does not provide high level objectives, but rather identifies specific air quality problems in the Borough. The study concludes that: The UK air quality objectives will be met for carbon monoxide, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, lead, sulphur dioxide and PM10, but not for nitrogen dioxide. The annual mean for nitrogen dioxide is likely to be exceeded in Hertsmere, mainly at locations in close proximity to the M25 and M1 and in the urban centres of Potters Bar and Borehamwood. There are no projected exceedences of the 2004 PM10 objectives, however the 2010 assessment suggested that the proposed annual mean and 24-hour mean objectives may be exceeded at many locations throughout Hertsmere. Although Local Authorities are not permitted at this stage to declare an Air Quality Management Area for a proposed objective, Hertsmere Borough Council should now be aware of this potential non-compliance for future planning and the provision of continuing monitoring programmes.</p> | <p>Potential key sustainability issue. May necessitate specific targets / indicators.</p> |
| <p>Hertsmere Environmental Strategy 2004</p> <p>This document reviews Hertsmere's existing Environmental Policy of, in particular to look at progress since the Policy was last reviewed in 1998/1999 and to highlight areas where further work needs to be done. The review takes account of changing policies and priorities at national, regional and sub regional level.</p> <p>Following this Policy Review, the Council states:</p> <p>"Hertsmere Borough Council is committed to promoting sustainable development and to protecting the special legacy of the Hertsmere environment. We recognise the importance to the Hertsmere community and to communities across the world of policies based on sound environmental principles. We will take the lead in maintaining the quality of life for the benefit of all who live and work in Hertsmere."</p> <p>The Council will:- Seek to keep to an absolute minimum the adverse environmental effects of its own buildings, equipment and operations Consider the environmental implications of all Council decisions</p> | <p>Identifies key sustainability objectives / issues. Consider incorporating in Hertsmere's SA objectives.</p> |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Meet and where possible exceed the environmental standards set by law Enforce to the best of its ability those environmental standards it has a duty to uphold Put environmental issues as a prime concern in local planning policy Work with local communities to improve their environment in accordance with their priorities and needs Work with partners across the regions and locally to promote environmental standards Campaign to raise awareness of environmental issues and promote environmental action through its recycling and energy conservation services</p> | |
| <p>Hertsmere Borough Council Best Value Performance Plan 2005-2006</p> <p>Identifies 5 strategic priorities for the Council (as reflected in community strategy): Create a safer environment Improving and sustaining the quality of Hertsmere's environment Address health inequalities Encourage economic development, employment and regeneration opportunities Encourage lifelong learning, leisure and cultural opportunities Improving accessibility to services and addressing inequalities</p> <p>Identifies a long list of corporate performance indicators.</p> | <p>Key sustainability issues to be reflected in SA objectives.</p> |

APPENDIX C

Baseline Data Tables

Table C1: Baseline Data

| Category | Theme | Indicator | Description | Hertsmere | Herts | East of England | National | Trends | Targets | Data Source | Comments |
|-------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Economy | Economy | Number of people employed | Workplace based count of employment | 2001: 55,117 2002: 45,951 2003: 44,995 2004: 41,849 | 502,267 487,617 n/k n/k | 2,271,254 2,277,763 n/k n/k | 22,057,115 22,175,255 n/k n/k | Employment in the Borough has been falling, due in part to the relocation of large employers to sites outside of the Borough. This is set against a rise in employment at the regional and national levels for those years for which data is available. Employment levels in Hertfordshire as a whole remain relatively stable. | | Annual Business Inquiry | Data available |
| Economy | Economy | Unemployed benefit claimants rate (%) | Resident based claimant count as of April of each year | 2001: 1.2 2002: 1.3 2003: 1.5 2004: 1.6 2005: 1.6 2006: 1.7 | 1.1 1.3 1.5 1.4 1.4 1.6 | 1.7 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 2.0 | 2.8 2.7 2.6 2.4 2.4 2.6 | Although the claimant rate has risen slowly since the start of the plan period, it has remained beneath both the regional and national average. The Borough experiences low unemployment in relation to the region and the UK as a whole. | | NOMIS | Data available |
| Economy | Economy | Average weekly earnings | | 2002: £578.70 2003: £619.30 2004: £627.90 2005: £609.60 | 577.60 604.60 609.60 648.70 | 501.90 523.60 534.00 549.70 | 472.10 487.00 498.60 517.00 | Hertsmere generally has a slightly higher level of average weekly earnings than Hertfordshire, which in turn has a significantly higher average earning than the EoE and the UK. | | NOMIS - Annual survey of hours and earnings | Data available |
| Economy | Economy | Gross value added per head | | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k | £19,248 £20,229 £21,441 | 13,967 14,725 15,565 | 14,944 15,691 16,485 | County has consistently performed above both regional and national rates. The regional rate is slightly below the national figure. | | Regional Accounts, ONS | Data available |
| Economy | Economy | VAT registered businesses: | a) Total number | 2001: 3,720 2002: 3,815 2003: 3,870 2004: 3,860 | 38,795 39,295 39,900 39,635 | 178,470 181,360 183,590 183,675 | 1,775,835 1,796,335 1,817,825 1,819,870 | Stats show a steady rate of increase in the number of VAT registered businesses at the local, county, regional and national levels. | | NOMIS | |
| | | | b) % change from previous year | 2001: 1.1% 2002: 2.6% 2003: 1.4% 2004: -0.3% | 1.1 1.3 1.5 -0.7 | 1.0 1.6 1.2 0.0 | 1.0 1.2 1.2 0.1 | However, the rate of increase in the number of registered businesses has been slowing. The latest figures showed a small decrease in both Hertfordshire and Hertsmere. | | NOMIS | |
| | | | c) New registrations pa as % of total | 2001: 10.2% 2002: 11.0% 2003: 11.2% 2004: 10.5% | 10.2 11.0 11.2 10.5 | 9.3 9.8 10.1 9.6 | 9.5 9.8 10.4 10 | There has been a slight decline in the proportion of businesses that are new registrations at all geographical levels. Coupled with the slowing rate of increase could be indicative in a slowing of entrepreneurial activity and / or economic slowdown. | | NOMIS | |
| | | | d) New registrations surviving 3 years | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k | 70.4% 72.8% 71.5% 71.1% | 71.0 71.6 71.5 70.9 | 68.2 69.3 69.5 68.9 | The County and the region have broadly comparable rates of survival, both of which are slightly above the national average | | Small Business Service | Results based upon third year of operation. E.g. 2004 results show percentage of businesses registered in 2001 still operational |
| Economy | Economy | Vacant employment land by Class (ha) | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | Local survey required |
| Economy | Economy | Vacant town centre shopping units (% of total) | | 2003: 5.4% 2004: 5.4% 2005: 4.8% 2006: 5.4% | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | | To not exceed national average (AMR) | Hertsmere Retail Surveys | Vacant units in the town, local town and district centres as defined in the Local Plan retail hierarchy |
| Environment | Heritage and landscape | Listed buildings: | a) Good condition (number / %) | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b) At risk (number / %) | 2005: 0 / 0% | n/k | n/k | n/k | No listed buildings were identified as being at risk in the latest English Heritage register. | 0% (AMR) | English Heritage | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | | c) Lost in previous year | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Heritage and landscape | Ancient monuments: | a) Good condition (number / %) | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b) At risk (number / %) | 2005: 0 / 0% | n/k | n/k | n/k | No ancient monuments were identified as being at risk in the latest English Heritage register. | | English Heritage | |
| | | | c) Lost in previous year | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Heritage and landscape | Green belt: | a) Total ha | 2003: 8,040 2004: 8,040 2005: 8,040 2006: 8,040 | 83,190 84,130 n/k n/k | n/k 237,000 n/k n/k | 1,671,400 1,678,200 n/k n/k | The area of Green Belt identified in the Local Plan has been successfully maintained. | No loss of designated Green Belt (AMR) | http://www.dclg.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1161678 | |
| | | | b) Net change | 2004: 0 2005: 0 2006: 0 | 940 n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | 6,800 n/k n/k | No change in Hertsmere's Green Belt since adoption of the 2003 Local Plan. Minor increases at both the County and National levels. | | | |
| Environment | Heritage and landscape | % of conservation areas with an up-to-date character appraisal | | 2002: 0 2003: 0 2004: 0 2005: 0 2006: 0 | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | No areas have existing up-to-date character appraisals | 40% by 2008 | HBC BVPP 2005 | Data can be easily collated. |
| Environment | Heritage and landscape | Landscape Conservation Areas | a) Total ha | 2004: 1,759 2005: 1,759 2006: 1,759 | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | The area identified as a Landscape Conservation Area in the Local Plan has been successfully maintained. | | | |
| | | | b) Net change | 2005: 0 2006: 0 | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | No change in Hertsmere's Landscape Conservation Area since adoption of Local Plan in 2003 | | Hertsmere BC GIS systems | |
| Environment | Land Use | Greenfield land: | a) Total ha | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b) Net change | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Land Use | Percent of new homes built on previously developed land | | 2002: 97% 2003: 99% 2004: 99.5% 2005: 100% 2006: 99.8% | 66 70 71 78 n/k | 57 60 64 71 n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | The tightly drawn Green Belt boundaries in the Borough mean that Hertsmere is well above National and regional targets and achievement rates in delivering housing from PDL. | 95% | HBC BVPP 2004-05 | Good, monitoring system already in place |
| Environment | Land Use | Average density of new housing | a) All development | 2004: 48.1dph 2005: 41.5dph 2006: 27.9dph | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | Average density of new housing has fallen since measurement started. In 2005/6, the average density fell below 30dph. However, this can largely be attributed to a large number of low density minor schemes and one for one replacements | PPG3 advocates densities of between 30 and 50dph | HBC Housing monitoring | dph = dwellings per hectare. Good, monitoring system already in place |
| | | | b) Major developments | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: 73.2dph 2005: 64.8dph 2006: 46.1dph | 35.5 41.8 43.1 51.3 n/k | 31.4 34.7 34.3 39.0 n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | Densities have also fallen for major schemes, though this is perhaps due more to differences in the sites / schemes completed than a long term trend. Average densities for major schemes in Hertsmere are above the average for both Hertfordshire and the Region. | PPG3 advocates densities of between 30 and 50dph | HBC Housing monitoring, EERA Annual Monitoring Reports | |
| Environment | Land Use | % of new housing built at 30 dwellings per hectare or higher | | 2004: 93% 2005: 88% 2006: 89% | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | For the three years that figures are available, the significant majority of new housing completed has been built above the 30dph threshold suggested in PPG3. | | HBC Housing Monitoring | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|--|---|--|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Environment | Biodiversity | Farmland Bird Species Population | | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | 95 93 90 n/k | 97 96 97 95 | Compared to a 1994 base, decline in farmland bird species has been greater in the East of England than in the UK as a whole. | Reverse long-term decline in populations | http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/progress/index.htm | Index based. 1994=100 |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Woodland Bird Species Population | | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | 103 97 103 n/k | 103 100 103 102 | Decline in Woodland bird species in the East of England is slightly above the national rate. However, it has shown signs of improvement, fluctuating around the 1994 level. | | http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/progress/index.htm | Index based. 1994=100 |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Bird numbers | a.) Skylark numbers (reflecting farmland) | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | -8% n/k n/k n/k | -17% -20% -22% -20% | -14% -14% -10% -13% | Declining nationally and in region though figures indicate skylark population remains relatively stable within the County. | | National and regional figures from breeding bird survey: http://www.bto.org/bbs/results/bbsreport.htm . Hertfordshire comparison (may not be available?) | National and regional figures compared to 1994 base. Local level data required for comparison (may not be available?) |
| | | | b.) Song Thrush numbers (reflecting woodlands and mixed farmland) | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | +23% n/k n/k n/k | -21% -19% -25% -18% | 13% 18% 14% 18% | Numbers increasing in Hertfordshire, mirroring national pattern. However, this runs against the trend of decline at the regional level. | | Quality of Life reports: http://www.hertsdirect.org/yrccouncil/hcc/en/v/you/raiseaware/quality/ | |
| | | | c.) House sparrow (reflecting urban environments) | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | +1% n/k n/k n/k | -22% -17% -20% -24% | -7% -2% -3% 1% | Population in decline at the regional level though relatively stable at the national and county level. | | | |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Wildlife sites: | a) total ha | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: 950.2 2005: 952.7 | 16,150 16,507 16,505 16,399 | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | Small increase in the total area designated as wildlife sites in Hertsmere. Slight decline in Hertfordshire figures | | Herts Biological Records Centre | |
| | | | b) net change (ha) | 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: +2.5 | 2003: +357 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | No net losses recorded. | | | |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Ecological quality of ponds | | n/k | 2004: 21% very high 44% good 28% poor 7% very poor | n/k | n/k | | | HEF QoL 2004 | Need to find local level data |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) | a.) Total ha | 2004: 30.7 2005: 30.7 2006: 30.7 | n/k n/k 2244 | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | No change in SSSI designation since adoption of Local Plan in 2003. | | www.Englishnature.org.uk/special/sssi/reportIndex.cfm | Only 2 SSSIs in Hertsmere (Redwell Wood & Castle Lime Works Quarry) - statistical comparisons not meaningful |
| | | | b.) Net Change | 2005: 0 2006: 0 | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | c.) Condition (%) | 2004: 50.0 2005: 50.0 2006: 50.0 | n/a n/a n/a | 36301420066.34 7181915066.5 | 66107160.0377.1661261 50.0478.9 | 461723140.0867. 745281890.0772.7 | Slight improvement in levels of condition at regional and national level. Notable increase in favourable measure within Hertfordshire. % meeting PSA target increased in all cases. | | |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Local Nature Reserves | a.) Total ha | 2004: 86 2005: 86 2006: 86 | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k | No change in LNR designation since adoption of Local Plan in 2003. | | HBC GIS System | No comparator data |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | b.) Net Change | 2005: 0 2006: 0 | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | c.) Condition | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Biodiversity | Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats | a.) Total ha | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b.) Net Change | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | c.) Condition | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Chemical river quality | % of rivers classified as good | 2001: 50 2002: 50 2003: 50 2004: 0 | 76 78 63 67 | 55 55 39 42 | 66 66 65 62 | Decline in quality at county and regional level though remaining stable at the national level | EoE: At least 91% Good or Fair by 2005 | Environment Agency, HEF QoL Reports, www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/ | National figures are for England only. Hertsmere figures based on 2 sites - statistical comparisons not meaningful. Hertfordshire figures are for overall quality. |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Biological river quality | % of rivers classified as good | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: 0 2004: n/k | 76 78 63 67 | n/k 81 80 77 | n/k 68 69 70 | Remaining relatively stable at the regional and national level. | EoE: At least 91% Good or Fair by 2005 | Environment Agency, HEF QoL Reports, www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/ | National figures are for England only. Hertsmere figures based on 1 site - statistical comparisons not meaningful. Hertfordshire figures are for overall quality. |
| Environment | Water and Soil | River quality objectives: % that passed/failed | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Water use by sector (domestic, industrial, government etc) | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Water consumption per capita (litres per head per day) | | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | 175 181 178 191 182 | 138 137 143 146 143 | 147 147 147 150 147 | Trends for all areas relatively stable though consumption in Hertfordshire above both the regional and national averages. | | HEF QoL Reports, www.sustainable-development.gov.uk | Figures for the region use Anglian Water consumption as proxy |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Agricultural land resource ('000 ha) | | 2002: n/k | n/k | 1,471 | 17,154 | 73% of agricultural land in the region is arable, more than any other UK region | | EERA SA 2004 | Need lower level data |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Planning Permissions granted resulting in a loss of grades 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land | a.) Number of permissions granted | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b.) Ha lost | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Water and Soil | Contaminated land: | a) amount (ha) | n/k | n/k | 300,000 (estimated) | n/k | | | EERA SA 2004 | Desktop exercise may be needed to measure area of contamination |
| | | | b) number of sites (BVPP - 'of potential concern to LA') | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | 1090 (HBC) | | |
| Environment | Air, climate and energy | CO2 emissions: | a) Total CO2 carbon emissions (million tonnes) | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: 0.276 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 11 n/k 13.6 n/k n/k | 153 149 152 152 153 | Further results required before meaningful trends can be interpreted. | | www.sustainable-development.gov.uk; www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk | |
| | | | b) per capita (kg per annum) | 2002: n/k 2003: 2,900 | n/k n/k | 2,300 2,480 | 2,600 2,470 | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--------------|
| Environment | Air, climate and energy | Air quality | Number of days of air pollution poor/moderate | 36 | 27 | 2002: Urban 45 2003: Urban 75 | 33 Rural: 60 19 Rural: 34 2003: Urban 51 Rural 68 | | HEF QoL; EERA SA 2004; Env Health & Housing HBC | Regional values are approximate averages based on place specific readings | |
| Environment | Air, climate and energy | Energy produced by renewable sources: | a) kWh | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | The proportion of energy from renewable sources is slowly increasing. | www.sustainable-development.gov.uk and www.renewableseast.org.uk | Need lower level data | |
| | | | b) as % of total energy production | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: /nk | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 2.5 2.9 2.7 3.6 4.3 | | | | |
| Environment | Air, climate and energy | % of all homes with renewable energy sources installed | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Resource use and waste | Total waste collected per annum: | a) total tonnage (thousand tonnes) | 2003: n/k | n/k | 22,196 | 224,683 | | www.sustainable-development.gov.uk | BV indicator | |
| | | | b) kg per head | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Resource use and waste | Total waste recycled per annum: | a) total tonnage (thousand tonnes) | 2003: n/k | n/k | 9,573 | 95,442 | | HBC BVPP 2005 | BV indicator | |
| | | | b) kg per head | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Resource use and waste | Household waste: | a) total collected | 2004: 88,088 | n/k | n/k | n/k | Hertsmere has performed below current National targets for recycling/ composting in the past, although it has now slightly exceeded it. Further improvement needed to meet 2015 target and particularly to meet Hertfordshire target of 50% by 2012. | National targets: 30% recycled by 2010, 33% by 2015. HCC target of 50% by 2012 | HBC BVPP 2005 | BV indicator |
| | | | b) total sent for recycling/composting | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | c) % recycled/composted | 2001: n/k 2002: 8 2003: 10 2004: 12 2005: 11 | n/k 10 13 16 17 | 15 17 19 23 n/k | 11 13 14 18 n/k | | | | |
| | | | d) total household waste per head | 2001: 377 2002: 380 2003: 417 2004: 414 2005: 416 | 495 503 508 495 507 | 491 521 520 505 n/k | 507 516 520 512 517 | | | | |
| | | | e) total recycling per head | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 58 91 101 118 n/k | 52 60 71 87 113 | | | | |
| Environment | Resource use and waste | Ecological footprint (global ha per person) | | 2004: 5.38 | 5.31 | N/a | 5.35 | Hertsmere has a larger ecological footprint than the county average and the national average. It is ranked 4 th among the 10 Herts LAs | Hertfordshire Biological Records | Calculated by HEF from local data | |
| Environment | Travel | Private car ownership | (a) % of households with | | | | | Herts has one of the highest levels of car ownership in the country. 2006 sample survey for Hertsmere indicated a rise in average car ownership. | 2001 Census, HBC Parking Survey | Small sample of 2006 survey mean differences are not statistically significant. | |
| | | | 0 cars | 2001: 18% 2005: n/k 2006: 7% | 18% 13% n/k | 19% n/k n/k | 26% n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | 1 car | 2001: 41% 2005: n/k 2006: 42% | 42% 43% n/k | 45% n/k n/k | 44% n/k n/k | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|--|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | | 2 or more cars | 2001: 41% 2005: n/k 2006: 51% | 40% 45% n/k | 36% n/k n/k | 29% n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | b.) Average vehicles per household | 2001: 1.4 2006: 1.6 | 1.34 n/k | 1.27 n/k | 1.11 n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Travel | Modal split for journeys | a.) to work | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Walk | 2001: 8% 2005: n/k | 9% 8% | 10% n/k | 11% n/k | Hertsmere and Hertfordshire have lower walking and cycling rates than region and UK, but greater use of train (note average Journey to Work distances by train are long, reflecting large commuting role). No significant changes in Hertfordshire between 2001 and 2005 survey. Further data required to allow trends to be identified. | 2001 Census, HCC Traffic Data Report 2003, HCC Traffic Data Report 2005. www.sustainable-development.gov.uk | Further Local Authority level data required for comparison. Figures may not sum to 100% due to independent rounding and grouping of categories. | |
| | | | Cycle | 2001: 1% 2005: n/k | 2% 2% | 4% n/k | 3% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Bus / Train | 2001: 18% 2005: n/k | 14% 19% | 5% n/k | 14% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Car | 2001: 60% 2005: n/k | 64% 66% | 79% n/k | 71% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Motorbike | 2001: 1% 2005: n/k | 1% 1% | 1% n/k | 1% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Other | 2001: 1% 2005: n/k | 2% 1% | 1% n/k | 1% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Works at home | 2001: 10% 2005: n/k | 9% 4% | 9% n/k | 9% n/k | | | | |
| | | | b.) shopping trips | | | | | Herts – low use of train for local journeys, bus is higher, but car dominates with 83% of all shopping journeys. Role of car as preferred mode consolidated between surveys | | | |
| | | | Walk or cycle | 2002: n/k 2005: n/k | 13% 6% | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | Public transport | 2002: n/k 2005: n/k | 11% 11% | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | Private vehicle | 2002: n/k 2005: n/k | 75% 83% | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | | | | |
| | | | c.) journeys to school | | | | | Trips by private car or walking and cycling broadly in alignment across geographical areas. Less children using public transport than national average. | | | |
| | | | Walk or cycle | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | 32% n/k n/k 49% | n/k n/k 45% n/k | n/k 47% 47% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Public transport | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | 15% n/k n/k 11% | n/k n/k 9% n/k | n/k 22% 22% n/k | | | | |
| | | | Private vehicle | 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | 40% n/k n/k 39% | n/k n/k 46% n/k | n/k 31% 31% n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Travel | Mean average distances for journeys (miles) | a.) to work | 2004: n/k | 13.1 | n/k | n/k | | | | Need to source LA level data |
| | | | b.) shopping | 2004: n/k | 5.8 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | c.) leisure | 2004: n/k | 10.6 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Environment | Travel | Greenway / Cycleway usage counts (specified locations) | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | Herts Traffic and Transport Data | Need to source LA level data |
| Environment | Travel | Length of greenways/ cycleways per head of population | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | Simple calculation required |
| Environment | Travel | Trip-generating developments | % of trip generating developments (approved) | | | | | Longer term data required to assess trends. | AMR contains a target for 100% of major | Hertsmere BC AMR | Data relates to approved major commercial developments |
| | | | a.) with Green Travel Plans being implemented | 2004: 100 2005: 25 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | b.) with Secure cycle storage facilities | 2004: 50 2005: 50 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | commercial developments to have a travel plan and incorporate cycling facilities. | | |
| | | | c.) located in high accessibility zones | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Society | Population and Household | Total Population | | 2001: 94,450 2002: 93,800 2003: 93,800 2004: 93,300 | 1,033,977 1,037,200 1,040,900 1,041,300 | 5,388,140 5,422,400 5,462,900 5,491,300 | n/k n/k 59,553,800 59,834,300 | The population estimates for Hertsmere have seen a falling population since the 2001 Census, in contrast to rises at the county, regional and national level. | | 2001 Census, ONS mid year estimates | |
| Society | Population and Household | Population Density | Persons per hectare | 2001: 9.35 2002: 9.29 2003: 9.29 2004: 9.24 | 6.29 6.31 6.34 6.34 | 2.82 2.84 2.86 2.87 | n/k n/k 2.45 2.47 | The population density in Hertsmere is almost 50% higher than for Hertfordshire as a whole, which in turn is more than twice as high as for the region and the country. | | | |
| Society | Population and Household | Average Household Size | | 2.49 | 2.42 | 2.37 | 2.36 | Household size continues to fall, although Hertsmere is above regional and national average household size. | | | |
| Society | Population and Household | Population distribution | Males Females Aged 0 to 15 Aged 16 to 74 Aged 75 and over | 48% 52% 19% 73% 8% | 49% 51% 18% 75% 7% | 49% 51% 19% 73% 8% | 49% 51% 19% 73% 8% | The population structure of Hertsmere closely matches that for the County, Region and UK as a whole. | | 2001 Census | |
| Society | Population and Household | Housing tenure | % of households Owner occupied: Owns outright Owner occupied: Owns with a mortgage or loan Rented from: Council (local authority) Rented from: Housing Association / Registered Social Landlord Rented from: Private landlord or letting agency Rented from: Other | 31.61 42.39 2.09 13.99 5.14 3.6 | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 30.67 41.53 11.61 4.91 7.57 3.2 | 29.46 38.76 13.24 5.95 8.72 3.22 | Hertsmere has slightly higher levels of home ownership than the region or country. The proportion of private lettings is lower than the regional and national figures. | | 2001 Census | National figures refer to England and Wales only. |
| Society | Population and Household | Housing Type | Percentage of households living in type of accommodation Whole house or bungalow: Detached Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached Whole house or bungalow: Terraced (including end terrace) Flat or maisonette Caravan or mobile home | 21.17 33.7 22.66 21.7 0.7 | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 30.17 31.21 23.5 12 n/k | 22.77 31.58 26.04 19.2 0.4 | The distribution of household accommodation types is closely matched to the regional and national figures. | | 2001 Census | |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | Index of multiple deprivation | a) Overall rank | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 1.6% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England n/k | 2.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England n/k | N/a | Hertsmere is relatively less deprived than the average for the EoE, although it is less affluent than the Hertfordshire average | | IMD 2004 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|--|-----|---|--|--|
| | | | | 38.7% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 45.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 30.9% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | | | | |
| | | | b) Income | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 1.6% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 32.3% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 0.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 1.8% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 36.0% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 2.8% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 7.8% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 25.6% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | N/a | Hertsmere has a low level of income disadvantage. | | |
| | | | c) Employment | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 41.9% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 0.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 0.3% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 52.4% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 1.8% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 5.7% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 33.1% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | N/a | Hertsmere has a low level of employment disadvantage. | | |
| | | | d) Education | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 32.3% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 0.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 5.9% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 52.4% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 5.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 14.4% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 19.2% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | N/a | Hertsmere has fewer educational disadvantages than the County or region. | | |
| | | | e) Barriers to housing and services | 6.5% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 22.6% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 0% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 4.5% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 14.9% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 14.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 9.0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 19.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 15.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | N/a | Hertsmere has a high level of disadvantage when it comes to barriers to housing and services. Housing affordability is thought to be the main factor. | | |
| | | | f) Health deprivation and disability | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 56.5% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 50.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | 0.8% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England 3.2% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 37.0% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% | N/a | Hertsmere has a very low level of health and disability deprivation. | | |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | Resident participation | % of residents surveyed who consider that they are happy with their level of involvement in decision making | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | Data required. Could be incorporated into MORI satisfaction surveys to obtain local level results. |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|-------------------------|---|
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | Long term unemployment | % of people claiming jobseekers allowance who have done so for a year or more | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: 13.7 | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 16.6 12.4 11.1 11.2 4n/k | 19.7 16.3 14.6 15.2 n/k | At the regional level, there is a long term trend of decline in the number of long term unemployed. Hertsmere marginally under national rate at 2005. | www.dtistats.net, HCC | Community strategy indicator |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | % of 18-24 year olds claiming unemployment related benefits | | 17.20% | 19.60% | n/k | n/k | | | Community strategy indicator |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | Income deprivation | % of under 16s living in income deprived families (below 60% of contemporary median) | 13.51 n/k | Average of published figures for HCC LAs is 12.75 n/k | 14 (before housing costs), 23 (after housing costs) n/k | 20 (before housing costs), 29 (after housing costs) n/k | Child poverty in Hertsmere is above the County average, and includes the 2 nd highest level of child poverty in Herts. | HEF QoL | Need to check comparability of local / County stats (HCC) with regional / UK stats (EERA). |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | % of economically active population with no qualifications | | 2001: 13.2 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: 11.9 | 10.6 n/k n/k n/k n/k | 10.5 10.1 10.7 9.6 n/k | 11.5 10.9 10.4 10.1 n/k | The proportion of unqualified people in Hertsmere is marginally higher than the County, regional and national average, although still below the England rate. More time series data is needed to identify trends. | www.dtistats.net | |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | % of economically active population with NVQ3 or higher qualifications | | 2001: 38.2 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: 44.2 | 50.3 n/k n/k n/k n/k | 44.7 45.5 45.8 47.3 n/k | 47.5 48.3 49.4 50.8 n/k | The proportion of people in Hertsmere with NVQ3 or higher qualifications is lower than the National average and the lowest of all Hertfordshire LAs. Trend of slow increase at the national level. | Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06 | Data available |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | % of adults with basic numeracy and literacy skills | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | % population in household with no wage earner | | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k 2005: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | 7.7 8.0 8.3 8.0 8.0 | 11.5 11.6 11.5 11.3 11.6 | The proportion of working age people in workless households has remained stable. | RSS 14 SA 2004 | Lower level data required |
| Society | Social inclusiveness and education | Child care facilities waiting lists / availability by location | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | Housing services | Further investigation required |
| Society | Accessibility | Public transport accessibility. | % of all uses within accessibility zones | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | Survey and GIS plotting | Work to define accessibility zones ongoing. Completion of this should allow information to be gathered for this indicator |
| Society | Accessibility | Proximity of services to population. | % of residences within identified threshold distance of services: Primary school (1500m) Secondary school (3000m) | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | Survey and GIS plotting | Work to define accessibility zones ongoing. Completion of this should allow |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | Child care centre (1500m) Doctor (1500m) Pharmacy (1500m) Bank (1500m) Post office (1500m) Job centre (3000m) Local open space (800m) District open space (1500m) Town centre (1500m) Supermarket (3000m) Library (1500m) | | | | | | | | information to be gathered for this indicator |
| Society | Accessibility | % of buildings open to the public that are suitable & accessible to disabled people | | 2004: 73.7 2005: 73.7 | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | Although the results place the council in the top 25% of UK authorities, further work is required to meet the target | 100% | HBC Best Value Performance Plan | |
| Society | Accessibility | % of new development within 1km of good public transport links | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | Survey and GIS plotting | Work to define accessibility zones ongoing. Completion of this should allow information to be gathered for this indicator |
| Society | Housing Need | % of dwellings not meeting the 'decent homes' standard | | 2001: n/k 2002: 2.4 2003: 4.7 2004: 3.8 2005: 3.9 | n/k n/k n/k n/k | 28.1 n/k n/k n/k | 33.1 n/k n/k n/k | Hertsmere is very low by national standards | | ODPM Regional Quality of Life counts | |
| Society | Housing Need | Housing affordability: | House price to income ratio for working households aged 20-39 (average price 2/3 bed dwelling vs. average household income) | 23:05.3 | 4.65 | 4.27 | 4.11 | Hertsmere is 31 st most unaffordable Local Authority in England and 2 nd most unaffordable in EoE after Cambridge | | Joseph Rowntree Foundation 'Affordability differences by area for working households buying their homes - 2003 update' | |
| | | | Housing affordability ratios - males | | | | | | | | |
| | | | a) Detached | 2003: 13.77 | 11.28 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b) Semi-detached | 2003: 6.56 | 6.17 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | c) Terrace | 2003: 5.33 | 4.71 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | d) Flat/maisonette | 2003: 4.40 | 3.67 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | Housing affordability ratios – Female | | | | | | | | |
| | | | a) Detached | 2003: 18.49 | 15.74 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b) Semi-detached | 2003: 8.81 | 8.61 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | c) Terrace | 2003: 7.15 | 6.58 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | d) Flat/maisonette | 2003: 5.91 | 5.12 | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Society | Housing Need | Homelessness | Proportion of families accepted as statutorily homeless within the last 2 years | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | New BV indicator. | 0.50% | Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06 | New BV indicator – data to be collected in future |
| Society | Housing Need | Homelessness, | Homeless Households in Bed and Breakfast Accommodation | n/k | n/k | 3.10% | 3.70% | New BV indicator. | 0% | Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06 | New BV indicator – data to be collected in future |
| Society | Housing Need | % of affordable homes completed as a percentage of all completions | | 2001: 10 2002: 24 2003: 28 2004: 35 2005: 10 2006: 25 | n/k n/k 18 18 22 n/k | n/k n/k 11 13 18 n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k n/k | Within Hertsmere, completion rates fluctuate year on year due to the build schedule on individual schemes. However, at the region a trend of increasing provision is emerging. | 15% | Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06, Regional AMR | Data collected as part of existing housing monitoring. |
| Society | Housing Need | Affordable housing units completed in the year: | | | | | | | 50% of completions | Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | a) with subsidy from the Council's assets or resources b) Otherwise through s106 agreements c) Other d) Total | | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | | to be funded through s106 in 2006-08. Target for 235 affordable completions in same period | |
| Society | Housing Need | Number of people on housing waiting list and average time on list | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | |
| Society | Housing Need | Number of abandoned homes | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | |
| Society | Housing Need | Number of unauthorised traveller encampments | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | Gypsy & Traveller needs study Requires informal survey (enforcement) Data available |
| Society | Well being | Total crime per 1000 population | | 2004: n/k | 92 | n/k | 113 | Herts is below Nat average | | |
| Society | Well being | Violent offences per 1000 population | | 2004: 11.1 2005: 15.4 | 11.9 16.1 | n/k n/k | n/k 20 | Hertsmere marginally below Hertfordshire figures and national average. Further time series data needed to build up a picture of trends. | | www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk |
| Society | Well being | Domestic burglaries per 1000 population | | 2004: 16.9 2005: 15.4 | 13.1 12.4 | n/k n/k | n/k n/k | Hertsmere marginally above Hertfordshire figures. Further time series data needed to build up a picture of trends. | | |
| Society | Well being | Fear of crime: % of people with a high level of worry about a.) Burglary b.) Car Crime c.) Violent Crime | | 9.1 10.5 12.8 11.0 15.9 13.2 | 9.1 10.5 12.8 11.1 15.9 13.3 | 8.6 8.6 10.9 9.7 15.2 14.3 | 13 12 15 13 n/k n/k | Fear of crime in Hertfordshire broadly comparable with the region as a whole but lower than nationally. Figures suggest that the majority of residents feel safe. | Increase the number of residents feeling safe by 1% pa to 88% in 2008 | HBC BVPP 2005, www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk Hertsmere and Hertfordshire data both give figures for Herts Policy Authority area. |
| Society | Well being | Life expectancy at birth | Males Females | 2002: 77.3 2005: 77.8 2002: 80.5 2005: 80.8 | n/k n/k n/k n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | 75.9 76.3 80.5 80.7 | Hertsmere is about equivalent to the England average for female LA and above average for males | | Beds & Herts Strategic Health Authority 2005, www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk |
| Society | Well being | General health: % of people describing their health as: | a) Good b) Fairly Good c) Not good | 2001: 73.2 2001: 20.2 2001: 6.6 | 73.1 20.3 6.6 | 70.4 22.1 7.6 | 68.6 22.2 9.2 | Hertsmere's residents consider themselves healthier than the average for the region and nation. Close correlation between Borough and County figures. | | 2001 Census |
| Society | Well being | People of working age with a limiting long-term illness | | 2001: 14.7% | 14.10% | 16.20% | 18.20% | There are fewer working age people with a long-term illness in Hertsmere | | 2001 Census |
| Society | Well being | Road accidents – persons killed or seriously injured | | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: 75 2004: 82 2005: n/k | 894 814 688 691 580 | n/k n/k 3,994 3,844 n/k | 40,560 39,407 32,296 34,351 32,155 | General downward trend nationally and in Hertfordshire, where there has been a significant reduction. Longer term time series data required to ascertain trends for Hertsmere and the region. | | DFT, www.hertsdirect.org/yrcouncil/hcc/env/plann/transplan/accdata/ |
| Society | Well being | Properties affected by flood risk | | n/k | n/k | 125,000 | approx 2 million | | | www.eelgc.gov.uk Further data required |
| Society | Well being | Deaths per 1000 population as a result of | a.) Coronary heart disease | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | www.sustainable-development.gov.uk Local level data required |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | b.) Cancer | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | 118.0 116.6 114.8 n/k | 128.8 126.5 124.0 121.6 | Figures indicate a slight decline though longer time series needed to reliably discern trends | | | |
| | | | c.) Suicide | 2001: n/k 2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: n/k | n/k n/k n/k n/k | 7.8 7.9 7.9 n/k | 9.3 8.9 8.6 8.6 | Figures indicate a slight decline though longer time series needed to reliably discern trends | | | |
| | | | d.) Accidents | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Society | Liveable Communities | Resident perceptions of town centres | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | Local survey required |
| Society | Liveable Communities | Resident perceptions of neighbourhoods | | 2005: 82% | n/k | n/k | n/k | 82% of residents were satisfied with the Borough as a place to live in 2005 resident satisfaction survey. | | MORI Survey | Data from other levels required for comparison |
| Society | Liveable Communities | Number of empty shops by town centre | a.) Borehamwood | 2003: 14 2004: 14 2005: 12 2006: 14 | n/a | n/a | n/a | Vacancy rates have remained consistent / stable in all of the Borough's main centres with the exception of Radlett where the number of vacancies has fallen and the district centre is now fully occupied. A higher number of vacant units in Borehamwood and Potters Bar. | | HBC Retail Surveys | |
| | | | b.) Bushey / Bushey Heath | 2003: 3 2004: 3 2005: 2 2006: 5 | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| | | | c.) Potters Bar | 2003: 10 2004: 12 2005: 13 2006: 11 | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| | | | d.) Radlett | 2003: 5 2004: 3 2005: 1 2006: 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| Society | Liveable Communities | High street individuality (proportion of local 'non-clone' shops in high streets), by centre | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | new economics foundation (nef) survey methodology | Needs to be incorporated into regular retail survey to gather local data |
| Society | Liveable Communities | Retail floorspace in centre vs. out-of-centre | % of retail floorspace in: | | | | | The Borough's retail floorspace remains is concentrated in town centre locations. The 2005 figures will be used as a baseline against which future changes will be monitored. | For the % of retail floorspace in out of town locations to not exceed the 2005 baseline. | HBC Retail Surveys | Comparator data required |
| | | | a.) Town Centres | 2005: 81 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | b.) Edge of Town locations | 2005: 2 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | c.) Out of Centre locations | 2005: 5 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| | | | d.) Out of Town locations | 2005: 12 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | |
| Society | Liveable Communities | % of land or highways that are of an unacceptable standard of cleanliness | | 2005: 12 | n/k | n/k | n/k | | 30% | Waste Services (BV199) | Community strategy indicator |
| Society | Liveable Communities | % of Borough deficient in various types of open space, as per needs survey | | n/k | n/k | n/k | n/k | | | | To be identified by open space needs study. |
| Society | Liveable Communities | % of residents satisfied with LA cultural services: | a) sports and leisure facilities | a) 57% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | SMILE - A culture and leisure strategy for Hertsmere | Cultural strategy indicator |
| | | | b) libraries | b) n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| | | | c) museums | c) 34% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| | | | d) arts activities and venues | d) 40% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |
| | | | e) parks and open spaces | e) 70% | n/a | n/a | n/a | | | | |

APPENDIX D
Policy Options Assessment

Table D1: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Location and Scale of Development - Development and Strategy and Hierarchy

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | + | In directing development to the major towns, the policy option would respect the existing hierarchy and maximise development opportunities, including the growth of essential facilities and services, in the most accessible 'main' locations. | +/- | A flattening of the existing hierarchy may result in improved facilities and services for some communities as a result of development opportunities being capitalised upon. However, there is a considerable risk that a less 'controlled' approach to development may result in over-burdening of some local services and facilities and failure of sustainable transportation systems, with detrimental effects against the objective. | ++ | An accessibility based approach to development, which includes services and facilities, has strong synergies with the objective and should therefore support it. | +/- | As Option 2 – not only is a market led approach likely to result in restricted types of development (i.e. preference for high value such as housing) that excludes services and facilities, but it is also likely to fail to reflect the sustainable transportation network. | -- | In permitting rural expansion, there is a considerable risk that new housing in rural areas would have poor access to essential services and facilities, exerting considerable pressure on rural centres. However, the scale of these negative effects will depend on the location of the rural expansion. | ++ | In directing development of a high density to the major towns, the policy option would respect the existing hierarchy and maximise development opportunities, including the growth of essential facilities and services, in the most accessible 'main' locations. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Rural expansion may help to meet the housing needs of concealed households | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| improve the quality and affordability of housing | | | | | | | | | | in rural areas. However, there is a risk that rural sites may be more attractive to market developers, serving to exacerbate problems of housing affordability in rural areas. | | |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | ++/- - | Focusing development on the 'main' towns in the District may have benefits in terms of ensuring that residents in the majority of settlements can access these centres by a range of modes; however, there is a risk that more peripheral areas will suffer decline as a result of a lack of targeted investment, which could exacerbate inequalities. | ++/- | The removal of the hierarchical approach to development location should contribute to a more equitable pattern of development across the District. However, there is a risk that a more dispersed approach to development may fail to be matched by requisite improvements in transportation networks, potentially increasing accessibility deprivation. | ++ | Focusing development in the most accessible locations across the District should help to improve opportunities for social engagement and promote a more equitable pattern of development and investment. | -- | Reliance upon the market will result in economically driven patterns of development – this is likely to favour the more affluent settlements and thus exacerbate incidences of social exclusion and inequality of opportunity. | +/- - | Permitting expansion of rural settlements may help to extend opportunities for local community engagement; however, there is a risk that a more dispersed approach to development may fail to be matched by requisite improvements in transportation networks, potentially increasing accessibility deprivation. | ++/- - | Focusing development on the 'main' towns in the District may have benefits in terms of ensuring that residents in the majority of settlements can access these centres by a range of modes; however, there is a risk that more peripheral areas will suffer decline as a result of a lack of targeted investment, which could exacerbate inequalities. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities | + | In focusing development in the more accessible 'main' towns, the policy option may help to improve | +/- | The removal of the hierarchy may result in a more equitable pattern of development, potentially including | ++ | In directing development to a wider range of accessible locations, the policy option should | -- | The market led approach is unlikely to deliver provision in the areas of greatest need, thus there is a risk that | +/- - | The opportunity to develop a new rural settlement (s) may result in the addition of some community based facilities | + | In focusing development in the more accessible 'main' towns, the policy option may help to improve |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | Option 5 – rural expansion | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|----------------------------|--|---|---|----|---|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | | | | | | |
| both geographically and demographically | | access to health care facilities, sporting and leisure provision for a wider range of the population. | | health care, sporting and leisure provision; however, there is a risk that this will not be supported by the transportation network, which could limit the spread of benefits. | | contribute to improved levels of access to health care, sporting and leisure provision for a wide section of the community. | | health inequalities may be deepened. | | including sporting and leisure provision; however, there is a risk that additional residential development will not be supported by the transportation network, which could limit the spread of benefits and restrict access to primary healthcare. | | access to health care facilities, sporting and leisure provision for a wider range of the population. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | ++ | By focusing development in the main towns in Hertsmere (Borehamwood and Potter Bar) is likely to ensure the most efficient use of PDL and existing buildings before greenfield sites. | + | By flattening or removing the hierarchy for development in Hertsmere this may result in a more dispersed development which may not result in making the most efficient use of PDL in the main towns but may able smaller towns to accommodate some development. This option should still avoid Greenfield development. | ++ | This option is similar to option 1 as the towns with the greater accessibility in Hertsmere are Borehamwood and Potters Bar also allow redevelopment of PDL and buildings in other towns such as Radlett and Bushey which is also likely to have positive effects. | - | This option is not to have a development hierarchy policy and is likely to result in an unstructured approach with no control over directing development in the main settlements and may result in greenfield development if there is no strict policy resisting development in greenfield sites. | -- | Rural expansion will not seek as priority, to make the best use of PDL and will involve Greenfield release which is contrary to this objective, to a greater extent than option 4. | +++ | By focusing high density development in the main towns in Hertsmere (Borehamwood and Potter Bar)it is likely to ensure the most efficient use of PDL and existing buildings before greenfield sites. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | ++ | By focussing development in the main towns in Hertsmere development is likely to be focussed on PDL that may require remediation of contaminated land | + | Flattening or removing the hierarchy may result in more dispersed development not making the best use of PDL. Consequently the area of land potentially remediated | ++ | Similar effect to option 1 as development of PDL is likely in other towns such as Radlett and Bushey. | - | Policy may result in greenfield development with consequent loss of valuable agricultural soil resources. | -- | Rural expansion will result in major levels of Greenfield development with significant negative effects through the permanent loss of agricultural land. | ++ | By focussing development in the main towns in Hertsmere development is likely to be focussed on PDL that may require remediation of contaminated land |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | before greenfield sites and thus no potential loss of valuable soil resources. | | may be reduced. | | | | | | | | before greenfield sites and thus no potential loss of valuable soil resources. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | + | Identification of a development hierarchy presents opportunities to continue with a spatial policy to direct development to the main towns in Hertsmere, potentially assisting in the protection and enhancement of historic buildings. | +/- | Removing the hierarchy would enable the Borough's towns to grow according to the availability of suitable sites over time however, with a hierarchy; the roles of difference centres may be insufficiently defined to achieve a desired balance of development potentially to the detriment of historic buildings through loss of local character and unsympathetic development. | + | This option would produce similar positive effects to option 1 as it is likely that development will still be focused in Borehamwood and Potters Bar due to these areas having high levels of accessibility. | - | This policy option will result in an unstructured approach with no control over spatial distribution of development potentially to the detriment historic buildings and features through impacts on local character resulting in harm to the setting of historic assets through unsympathetic development. | -- | Rural expansion, depending on location, is likely to have overall negative effects on landscape character, however, focusing in one area in Hertsmere, may allow for mitigation. | +/- | Substantial urban intensification directed to the main towns in Hertsmere, may potentially assist in the protection and enhancement of historic buildings. However development at such density is likely to have a significant negative effect on landscape character. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects as this policy option concentrates all development within the two main urban centres. | 0 | No obvious effect as this option, whilst flattening the hierarchy, would still encourage development in the settlements in Hertsmere. | 0 | No obvious effects as this policy option concentrates all development within the two main urban centres. | -- | Potential negative effects with this policy as removing policy and leaving up to the market may result in development in greenfield areas which are considered desirable for developers. | -- | Potential negative effects as this option will result in Greenfield release which may be detrimental to the quality of the countryside and local landscape, however, focusing development in one chosen area, may allow for mitigation. | 0 | No obvious effects as this policy option concentrates all development within the two main urban centres. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve | ++ | Focussing development in main towns is likely to make the best use of | - | Dispersed development would be contrary to the development of a | +++ | Accessibility based approach allows flexibility to consider the | -- | Unrestricted growth is likely to lead to greater use of the private car and | -- | Rural expansion is likely to lead to greater use of the car and traffic congestion, | +++ | Focussing high density development in main towns is likely to make the best use |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | | existing sustainable transport infrastructure. | | sustainable transport system and would lead to growth in car usage and congestion. | | provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and could allow for significant levels of modal shift across the District. | | associated congestion problems. | | particularly in areas that currently may not suffer from congestion problems. | | of existing sustainable transport infrastructure. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | - | Possible negative effects as brownfield sites and urban infill sites may be of importance for local biodiversity which would be under pressure through intensifying development in the two main towns. | - | Possible negative effects as brownfield sites and urban infill sites may be of importance for local biodiversity which would be under pressure through intensifying development in the main settlements in Hertsmere. | - | Possible negative effects as brownfield sites and urban infill sites may be of importance for local biodiversity which would be under pressure through intensifying development in the two main towns. | -- | The extent to which this option could result in the development of Greenfield sites important for local biodiversity, this option is likely to have moderately negative effects. | --- | This option will involve the loss of Greenfield and the extent to which, Greenfield sites are important for local biodiversity, this option is likely to have strongly negative effects, as certainty of Greenfield development with this option is higher. | -- | Possible negative effects as brownfield sites and urban infill sites may be of importance for local biodiversity which would be under pressure through substantially intensifying development in the two main towns. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Potential negative effects as policy may result in greenfield development with negative effects on water quality through runoff from impermeable surfaces. | --- | Potential negative effects as policy may result in greenfield development with negative effects on water quality through runoff from impermeable surfaces. Scale of effect greater than Option 4 as certainty of Greenfield development is higher. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | - | Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased water consumption. | - | Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased water consumption. | - | Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased water consumption. | - | Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased water consumption. | - | Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased water consumption. | - | Potential negative effects as additional high density development would result in increased water consumption. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of | - | Potential negative effects as additional | - | Potential negative effects as additional | - | Potential negative effects as additional | - | Potential negative effects as additional | - | Potential negative effects as additional | -- | Potential negative effects as additional |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| flooding taking account of climate change | | development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk. | | development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk. | | development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk. | | development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk. | | development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk. | | high density development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | ++/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Focussing development in main towns will lead to use of sustainable transport with improvements in air quality, although use of vehicles is likely to grow with potential negative effects on air quality. | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on air quality. In addition, more dispersed development is likely to result in negative effects in deteriorating air quality in more localised areas. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 16. Growth will be based on accessibility to services and public transport and may result in a lower level of vehicle use than option 1. | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on air quality. | --- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on air quality. Scale of effect is likely to be significant. | ++/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Focussing development in main towns will lead to use of sustainable transport with improvements in air quality, although use of vehicles is likely to grow with potential negative effects on air quality. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport usage in main towns will minimise greenhouse gas emissions, although any development will increase greenhouse gas emissions unless carbon neutral. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions. Although any development will increase greenhouse gas emissions unless carbon neutral. | ++/- | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Growth will be based on accessibility to services and public transport and may result in a lower level of vehicle use than option 1, although any development will increase greenhouse gas emissions unless carbon neutral. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions. | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport usage in main towns will minimise greenhouse gas emissions, although any development will increase greenhouse gas emissions unless carbon neutral. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| increase the use of renewable energy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | +/- | In focusing development in the main towns, there is the opportunity to improve the economy of these centres; however, the spatial approach does not support a balanced economy across the District. | ++/- | This policy option affords greater flexibility for development to respond to site availability, which may be more equitable. However, there is a risk that transport infrastructure will fail to reflect development patterns and increased development pressure in smaller centres may have adverse environmental implications, both of which may result in detrimental effects against the objective. | ++ | In focusing development in the most accessible locations, the policy option presents the opportunity to create a more balanced economy served by effective transport infrastructure. | +/- - | The market approach is essentially economically driven and thus represents the potential to maximise economic benefits in certain locations. However, the nature of market led growth is likely to lead to greater imbalances between settlements and thus undermine the objective. | +/- | Development in rural areas may help to better support the rural economy through increased availability of sites for both employment and residential development. However, dispersed patterns of development are likely to have increased pressure on rural services may have adverse effects on economic stability of smaller centres. | ++/- - | In focusing development in the main towns, there is the opportunity to improve the economy of these centres; however, the substantial urban intensification does not support a balanced economy across the District. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | +/- | In focusing development on the main settlements, the policy option should have significant benefits for these towns; however this may be at the | ++/- | This policy option would result in development within a wider range of settlements across the District – although this may have localised benefits, such an | ++ | In focusing development in a range of the most accessible town centres, this policy approach should help to support the vitality and viability | +/- - | The market approach is essentially economically driven and thus while it may result in considerably increased vitality | -- | Rural expansion is likely to draw population away from town and service centres, creating a more dispersed development pattern. However, these | ++/- - | In focusing development on the main settlements, the policy option should have significant benefits for these towns; however this may be at the |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position (Bwood / PB first) | | Option 2 – Flatten / remove hierarchy | | Option 3 - Accessibility based approach | | Option 4 - Market led / do nothing | | Option 5 – rural expansion | | Option 6; Substantial Urban Intensification | |
|------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | expense of the smaller towns in the District. | | approach may not be supported by the necessary infrastructure, which could undermine the ability of town centres to remain vital and viable. | | of these more accessible areas. | | and viability in certain towns; this is likely to be tempered with greater inequality and decline of other centres in the District. | | negative effects would be less if one large rural extension is identified. Overall, however, this option may undermine the attractiveness of certain town centres, encouraging rural residents to travel further for town centre services, potentially outside the Hertsmere boundary. | | expense of the smaller towns in the District. |

Table D2: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Location And Scale Of New Development – Employment Land Uses

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non- designated employment land sites. | | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | | Option 5 - Do nothing | |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | This policy option may result in providing opportunities for enhanced access to employment by controlling the location of employment sites. | + | [This option would enable the redistribution of employment land potentially to more accessible areas therefore offering enhanced access to employment opportunities. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | ++ | Releasing all employment sites in Hertsmere will result in these sites going for higher land values such as housing which will have overall positive effects on this objective and providing a greater provision of affordable housing in combination with | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Potential that not allowing release of certain employment sites may not contribute to meeting housing targets. | + | Potential that in controlling the location of employment sites, this option may also contribute to meeting housing targets to a certain extent. | + | With this option there is the potential to allow existing employment sites that may be unviable or in poor locations to be developed for housing which will contribute to meeting identified housing needs to a certain extent. | ++/- | It is likely if there is no policy intervention that employment sites will be lost to housing where there is a high demand and which have higher land value and as such, would contribute to meeting identified housing needs but also no control over proportion of |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non- designated employment land sites. | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | Option 5 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|----|--|-----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | theme 8. | | | | | | | | | | affordable housing secured. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | This policy option may result in providing opportunities for enhanced access to employment by controlling the location of employment sites which may contribute to reducing social exclusion and promoting equal opportunities to employment in certain deprived areas. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographicall y | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land | ++ | Release of existing employment areas will allow them to be used for other uses such as housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Prevents the use of land for other uses such as housing, which may then be forced on to Greenfield sites. Scale | + | A spatial control over the location of employment may contribute to making the most efficient use | +/- | Redistribution of land may results in more efficient use of land in general with employment land being | 0 | With no policy intervention, it is unlikely that employment will be met on previously |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non- designated employment land sites. | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | Option 5 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|----|---|----|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | preventing development on Greenfield sites for this use. | | | | of effect dependent on demand for housing sites. | | of PDL over Greenfield release. | | situated in suitable areas and vice versa with housing land. However, this option may result in Greenfield release for employment use thus conflicting with this objective. | | developed land due to higher land values for other uses such as housing. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | + | Release of employment land for other uses may lead to remediation of contaminated employment sites. | + | Release of non- designated employment land for other uses may lead to remediation of contaminated employment sites. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Release of employment land for other uses may lead to remediation of contaminated employment sites. | + | Release of employment land for other uses may lead to remediation of contaminated employment sites. | + | Release of employment land for other uses may lead to remediation of contaminated employment sites. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | +/- | Employment land is most likely to be replaced by housing which could cause deterioration in the landscape quality, depending on the nature of the employment land previously. However, release of | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | Is likely to have no obvious effect over the current baseline. | + | This option has the potential to control what employment uses go where in Hertsmere which could minimise negative effects on the countryside and local landscape. | - | The extent, to which this option may result in Greenfield release for employment uses, is likely to have negative effects on this objective. | +/- | Employment land is most likely to be replaced by housing which could cause deterioration in the landscape quality, depending on the nature of the employment land previously. However, release of |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non-designated employment land sites. | | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | | Option 5 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | employment sites for housing may enhance the quality of the local landscape. | | | | | | | | | | employment sites for housing may enhance the quality of the local landscape. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | -- | Potential for negative effects on traffic congestion as land may be released for residential development. The scale of effect is dependent on the location of site and accessibility to public transport. | - | Non-designated sites may be lost to residential development with potential negative effects on traffic congestion. | 0 | Is likely to have no obvious effect over the current baseline. | + | By controlling the location of employment uses sites can be located near existing public transport infrastructure, promoting more sustainable modes of transport as an alternative option to the car. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects dependent on scale and location of redistribution. Potential negative effects could be mitigated by ensuring employment uses with are preferentially located near public transport modes. | -- | With no protection employment sites are likely to be lost to housing. See effect of option 1. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | - | Employment land which is vacant at night may provide some locally important habitat. Replacement by housing could damage this role. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Control may protect important wildlife and habitats. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Employment land which is vacant at night may provide some locally important habitat. Replacement by housing could damage this role |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non-designated employment land sites. | | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | | Option 5 - Do nothing | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| account of climate change | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16. To improve local air quality | -- | Potential for negative effects as land may be released for residential development, at a higher density than existing employment uses, with secondary negative effects on air quality through increased car use and congestion. | - | Similar effect to Option 1 – although effect not likely to be as significant due to retention of designated sites with the policy option. | 0 | Is likely to have no obvious effect over the current baseline. | + | By controlling the location of employment uses sites can be located near existing public transport infrastructure, with potential reduction in car use and improvements to local air quality. Scale of effect is dependent on the specific location of employment sites. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Potential for positive and negative effects dependent on the location of employment uses and the update of sustainable modes of transport or vehicle use and associated emissions. | -- | With no protection employment sites are likely to be lost to housing. See effect of option 1. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | - | Potential for negative effects through increased density of development and associated greenhouse gas emission increases. | - | Potential for negative effects through increased density of development and associated greenhouse gas emission increases. | 0 | Is likely to have no obvious effect over the current baseline. | +/- | Locating new development adjacent to sustainable transport may have a positive effect through reduced emissions. However, any new development is likely to have negative effects on emissions of greenhouse gases. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Locating new development adjacent to sustainable transport may have a positive effect through reduced emissions. However, any new development is likely to have negative effects on emissions of greenhouse gases. | - | Potential for negative effects through increased density of development and associated greenhouse gas emission increases. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable | - | Areas may have been designated due to their proximity to housing. Releasing them could cause an increase in the need to travel to other employment areas | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non- designated employment land sites. | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | Option 5 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|------|---|----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| energy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | -- | Failure to protect any employment sites across the Borough will render it increasingly difficult to successfully develop sites for employment uses when they are competing with higher value development such as housing. The resultant effect is likely to be highly detrimental to economic prosperity. | +/- | In not protecting non-designated employment sites, pressure for redevelopment for higher value uses is likely to increase. Dependent on the nature of development, this may result in positive (e.g. better response to market) or negative (e.g. failure to balance employment to homes) effects. | +/- | In protecting all employment land irrespective of use, there is a risk that the economy will become imbalanced with poor co-ordination of jobs and homes and retention of sites that no longer meet business requirements. However, on the other hand this option is the only option that protects all employment land and if the employment land study identifies no surplus in existing employment areas then this policy option would allow the continuation of a stable economy. | ++/- | This policy approach offers the opportunity to ensure that employment development is matched to settlement needs in terms of use and spatial distribution. However, there is a risk that it could be overly prescriptive, thus limiting entrepreneurial activity and constraining the ability to adapt to the market. | ++ | The redistribution of employment sites on the basis of improving the ease and attractiveness of development (through selective site disposal and greenfield release) should help to increase take up of employment sites for development as well as enabling development of former employment sites for alternative uses. This has the potential to significantly support the economy and presents a proactive balance. | -- | Under the do nothing option, it is highly likely that much employment land will be lost to higher value development such as housing, which is likely to lead to a gross imbalance between housing and employment, resulting in an unsustainable economy. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | - | Failure to protect employment sites for continued employment use may have significant detrimental effects in town centres where, | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | In adopting a policy approach that includes a spatial element, this option presents opportunities to ensure that employment type and | + | The release of constrained employment sites within town centre for alternative forms of development may have benefits for town centre | -- | Without policy intervention, it is likely that employment uses within town centres will be amongst those lost to higher |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Release of designated employment areas for other uses. | | | Option 2 – Continue 'no protection' approach to non- designated employment land sites. | | | Option 3 - Keep all employment land - both in designated and non designated areas - for only employment uses. | | | Option 4 - Control what uses may be located in which areas in the Borough. | | | Option 5 - redistribution of employment land | | | Option 5 - Do nothing | | |
|--|----|---|---|--------------------------|----|---|----|--|---|--------------------------|----|--|----|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | | | |
| | | over time, competing development pressure is likely to lead to employment loss. Without business activity in town centres, vitality and viability are likely to be compromised. | | | | | | location is determined in a manner that will maximise complementary benefits for town centre vitality and viability. | | | | vitality and viability through enabling beneficial development of vacant/under-used sites, for example for housing or leisure uses. | | | value development, with corresponding detrimental effects for town centre vitality and viability, potentially creating dormant villages. | | |

Table D3: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: location and scale of development - Extent of Green Belt

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Review Green Belt, where required to meet growth targets | | Option 3 - Extend Green Belt, including incorporation of safeguarded areas back into the Green Belt, notwithstanding growth targets | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | ++ | The release of greenbelt to meet the growth targets may contribute to meeting the housing needs in Hertsmere. | - | Extending the greenbelt boundary may preclude Hertsmere meeting housing targets and therefore is likely to have negative effects against this objective. | ++ | Having no policy intervention is likely to mean developers will contribute to meeting identified housing targets drive by market demand and profit. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | + | Protection of existing green belt from development may have indirect health benefits in terms of safeguarding land for recreation and leisure. Protecting vegetation can also assist with improving air quality, which can have health benefits, particularly for respiratory disorders. | - | The review option is likely to result in a reduction of green belt over time. This is likely to have adverse effects in terms of reducing land available for recreation and leisure. Increased built development on former greenfield land may also adversely affect air quality, which may have disbenefits for health. | ++ | Extension of the green belt is likely to have benefits in terms of increasing the amount of land available for recreation and leisure. Improvements to air quality are also likely, with attendant health benefits, particularly for respiratory disorders. | -- | Without intervention, green belt land is likely to be lost to built development. This is likely to have adverse effects in terms of reducing land available for recreation and leisure. Increased built development on former greenfield land may also adversely affect air quality, which may have disbenefits for health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most | + | While current green belt | - | Growth targets are likely to push | ++ | Extending green belt is likely to | -- | Without protection from policy, green |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | Option 2 – Review Green Belt, where required to meet growth targets | Option 3 - Extend Green Belt, including incorporation of safeguarded areas back into the Green Belt, notwithstanding growth targets | Option 4 - Do nothing | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | boundaries are maintained development will be constrained to previously developed land. | | development into Greenfield sites as previously developed sites are exhausted. | | force further development to take place on previously developed land and buildings. | | belt would be considered for development as this is generally more desirable for developers. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | ++ | Retention of current green belt policies will have a significant positive effect on safeguarding soil quality and quantity. | -- | May result in the loss of green belt to development with potential for negative effects through direct loss of soil resources. | +++ | Likely to safeguard additional land from development over option 1 with greater positive effects. | --- | Will result in the loss of significant areas of protected land to development and associated permanent loss in soil resources. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | + | Protection will be maintained with this policy option while boundaries remain the same. | - | Risk of some negative effects on historic assets and their setting if the review leads to development in green belt in response to growth. | ++ | Extension of green belt will afford further protection to landscape character and heritage assets. | -- | Without protection from policy, green belt could be considered for development with potential negative effects on landscape and historic assets. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Protection will be maintained with this policy option while boundaries remain the same. | - | Risk of some negative effects on the quality of the greenbelt if the review leads to development in green belt in response to growth. | ++ | Extension of green belt will afford further protection to the greenbelt. | -- | Without protection from policy, green belt could be considered for development with negative impacts on the countryside and landscape |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Retention of existing policy concentrates development within urban areas which is likely to be better connected to sustainable modes of transport. | - | May result in new developments in urban fringe locations that would be poorly linked to sustainable transport modes leading to development that is dependent on the car for access. | ++ | Similar effect to option 1 although to a greater extent. | -- | Likely to lead to isolated developments located away from sustainable modes of transport which will depend on the private car. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Protection will be maintained with this option while boundaries remain the same. | - | Risk of some negative effects to local biodiversity if review leads to development in green belt in response to growth. | ++ | Extension of green belt will afford further protection to biodiversity sites and important flora and fauna found in Greenfield locations. | -- | Without protection from policy, green belt could be considered for development with negative effects on the wildlife and habitats. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Retention of existing policy protects water resources in green belt areas. | - | May result in development in greenfield locations with negative effects on water quality during construction and in the long term from runoff from impermeable surfaces. | ++ | Additional protected land will have a significant positive effect on water quality in those newly protected areas. | -- | Likely to lead to greenfield development with consequently significant negative effects on water quality from construction and run off. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Review Green Belt, where required to meet growth targets | | Option 3 - Extend Green Belt, including incorporation of safeguarded areas back into the Green Belt, notwithstanding growth targets | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | New development from this option will require additional water resources; however, water saving devices could be incorporated into new development. | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | New development from this option will require additional water resources; however, water saving devices could be incorporated into new development. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | + | Likely to have a positive effect by restricting development in areas of green belt therefore reducing the potential risk of flooding but not allowing development. | - | May result in development in greenfield locations with negative effects on flood risk. | + | Likely to have a positive effect by restricting development in areas of green belt and therefore reducing the risk of flooding. | -- | This option may result in development in greenfield locations thus exacerbates the risk of flooding, to a greater extent in designated floodplain areas. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | See assessment of objective 11. Additional traffic and congestion generated by development may lead to a negative effect on air quality. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | See assessment of objective 11. Additional traffic and congestion generated by development may lead to a negative effect on air quality. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than option 2. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | See assessment of objectives 11+16. Additional traffic and congestion may lead to a negative effect on greenhouse gas emissions. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | See assessment of objectives 11+16. Additional traffic and congestion may lead to a negative effect on greenhouse gas emissions. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than option 2. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No effect | ++ | Increasing land available through reviewing greenbelt boundaries may result in land being released for housing or employment which is likely to benefit the economy in Hertsmere. | - | Extending the greenbelt may preclude land available to meet the housing targets or employment land requirements which is likely to be detrimental to the economy. | + | With no policy intervention, the market will decide on the uses of land in the greenbelt which may contribute to supporting the economy in Hertsmere however, leaving it to the market will result in uncertainty. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town | + | Protection of the green belt is likely to result in greater concentration of development | +/- | The review approach is likely to result in a reduction of green belt arising from development pressure. This | ++ | Extension of the green belt is likely to result in much greater densities of development within | -- | No policy intervention is likely to result in widespread loss of greenfield land to development |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | | Option 2 – Review Green Belt, where required to meet growth targets | | Option 3 - Extend Green Belt, including incorporation of safeguarded areas back into the Green Belt, notwithstanding growth targets | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|---|----|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| centres | | within existing settlements, which should help to improve their viability through increased demand for services and facilities. | | could have positive or negative effects – greenfield development may further disperse the population; or alternatively, planned development through urban extensions or similar may better support vitality and viability. | | the existing settlements. Increased population in locations more accessible to existing settlements should help to support town centre vitality and viability. | | pressure. This presents a much heightened risk of more dispersed development patterns, which are less able to support town centres. |

Table D4: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Location and scale of development

– Gypsies

Scale of effect (SE): Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Acknowledgement of need. Sites considered on their merits. | Option 2 –Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites but do not identify sites. | Option 3 - Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites and identify sites according to criteria. | Option 4 - Existing policy. | Option 5 - Market let / do nothing. | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|----------|--|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | This option offers the opportunity to ensure that sites for gypsies are well related to essential services and facilities, which would meet objective for this section of the population. | + | This option offers opportunity to include access to essential services and facilities as one of the assessment criteria for future site identification, which would meet objective for this section of the population. | ++ | This option offers the opportunity to allocate sites for gypsies that are well related to essential services and facilities for this section of the population, to a greater extent than option 1. | +/- | Under this policy option there is a requirement to provide evidence of need. This will not necessarily be linked to ensuring that sites are well located in relation to access to services and facilities – the policy option may therefore have positive and/or negative effects dependent on the individual cases of implementation. | -- | This policy option is likely to give rise to one of two eventualities – either gypsies will be dissuaded from settling in Hertsmere; or encampments may appear on any available land. In the case of the latter, the likelihood is that such land will be greenfield and thus poorly related to essential services and facilities, with detrimental effects against the objective. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing. | + | The policy option offers the opportunity to ensure that the housing needs of gypsies can be met through the planning system. | +/- | The criteria assessment approach may be successful in delivering appropriate housing sites for this section of the population; however, there is a risk that without allocation, appropriate sites may be lost to higher | ++ | The policy option should help to ensure that allocation of appropriate sites to meet the housing needs of gypsies through the planning system through direct allocation of future sites. | +/- - | Theoretically, this policy option presents the opportunity to ensure that housing needs of gypsies are met through the planning system; however, the inclusion of a requirement to demonstrate need and accord with all plan policies presents a considerable risk that no | -- | In failing to recognise the housing needs of gypsies, this policy fails to meet the objective. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Acknowledgement of need. Sites considered on their merits. | Option 2 –Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites but do not identify sites. | | Option 3 - Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites and identify sites according to criteria. | | Option 4 - Existing policy. | | Option 5 - Market let / do nothing. | |
|---|----|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | value development and thus gypsies will be excluded. | | | | suitable sites will be justified/released. | | |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | ++ | The policy option seeks to provide a mechanism for accommodating the gypsy community, thus assisting in social inclusion. | + | The policy option seeks to provide a mechanism for accommodating the gypsy community, thus assisting in social inclusion. However, without specific site allocation, certainty of benefits is reduced. | ++ | In identifying criteria and allocating specific sites, the policy option seeks to provide a mechanism for accommodating the gypsy community, thus assisting in social inclusion. | + | The policy provides a mechanism for accommodating the gypsy community, thus assisting in social inclusion. However, the requirement to justify need presents a constraint that limits the scale of any beneficial effects. | -- | In failing to recognise the requirement to meet the housing needs of gypsies through the planning system, the policy option is likely to perpetuate social exclusion of this group of the population. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | + | In recognising the needs of gypsies and providing a mechanism for the identification of sites, this policy option helps to safeguard against certain crimes such as trespassing and criminal damage. | + | In recognising the needs of gypsies and providing a mechanism for the identification of sites, this policy option helps to safeguard against certain crimes such as trespassing and criminal damage. | ++ | In recognising the needs of gypsies and allocating specific sites for encampments, the policy option should help to safeguard against certain crimes such as trespassing and criminal damage. In identifying future sites this has the potential to reduce fear of crime through ensuring sites are properly planned and managed, | +/- - | This policy option provides a mechanism for the allocation of specific sites for gypsy encampments. However, the requirement to demonstrate need is a constraint and may potentially result in an exacerbation of certain criminal activity such as trespassing and criminal damage as encampments are set up on unauthorised sites, pending planning decisions. | -- | In failing to recognise the requirement to meet the housing needs of gypsies, this policy option is likely to result in an exacerbation of certain criminal activity such as trespassing and criminal damage as encampments are set up on unauthorised sites that are unregulated therefore increasing the fear of crime. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | + | In supporting an element of site assessment, the policy option offers the opportunity to ensure that encampments are accessible to health care, leisure and recreational facilities and can be serviced by appropriate sanitation arrangements. | ++ | The use of criteria based assessment of sites offers the opportunity to ensure that encampments are accessible to health care, leisure and recreational facilities and can be serviced by appropriate sanitation arrangements. | ++ | The use of a criteria based assessment and allocation of gypsy sites presents the opportunity to ensure that allocated sites are well related and accessible to essential services and facilities, including health care, leisure and recreation provision, and are serviced by appropriate sanitation arrangements. | - | The need based assessment of gypsy sites offers only limited scope to influence the physical location of sites. As such, this policy option is unlikely to consistently deliver sites that have access to health care and leisure/recreational facilities, which is likely to result in detrimental effects against the objective. | -- | This policy option is likely to give rise to one of two eventualities – either gypsies will be dissuaded from settling in Hertsmere; or encampments may appear on any available land. In the case of the latter, the likelihood is that such land will be greenfield and thus poorly related to essential services and facilities, including proper sanitation, with detrimental effects against the objective. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Acknowledgement of need. Sites considered on their merits. | Option 2 –Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites but do not identify sites. | Option 3 - Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites and identify sites according to criteria. | Option 4 - Existing policy. | Option 5 - Market let / do nothing. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | +/- | The consideration of sites on their merits will allow appropriate mitigation measures to be included to minimise the potential effects of contamination on soil quality. However, Policy may not be strong enough to ensure appropriate sites are considered. | + | Policy will allow for greater control over site selection, consequently potential negative effects on soil quality and quantity may be avoided or more easily mitigated. | ++ | Similar effect to option 2, however the identification of site will allow for greater certainty that potential negative effects on soil quantity and quality can be avoided or mitigated. | +/- | The current need based assessment offers only limited scope to influence the physical location of sites. Therefore, although the policy may enable sites to be located to minimise effects on soil quality and quantity, the current policy does not provide guidance on the consideration of soil issues and potential negative effects may not be adequately mitigated. | -- | No control over sites for gypsies is likely to result in contamination and reduce soil quality and quantity particularly if they choose agricultural land of good quality. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | +/- | Consideration on sites on their own merits presents an element of control to reject sites in areas of good landscape quality. However, the extent to which sites often | +/- | Criteria based approach if it sets out a criterion to protecting landscape quality in identifying future sites, this approach may have positive effects. However, the extent to which sites often chosen | ++ | Identification and allocation of sites is likely to ensure that local landscape quality is not affected. | - | It is unlikely that the existing policy which recognises need but does not identifying sites may result in negative effects as sites are chosen in countryside locations. | -- | No identification of sites for gypsies through intervention may result in them choosing their own sites which may mean adversely affecting the countryside and local landscape. In addition, there will be no opportunity |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Acknowledgement of need. Sites considered on their merits. | Option 2 –Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites but do not identify sites. | | Option 3 - Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites and identify sites according to criteria. | | Option 4 - Existing policy. | | Option 5 - Market let / do nothing. | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | chosen away from settlement areas, this option may have a detrimental effect on local landscape. | | away from settlement areas, this option may have a detrimental effect on local landscape. | | | | | | for intervention to ensure negative effects are minimised/ |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | - | Without specific criteria, opportunities to service sites with public transport infrastructure would not be available. | + | Policy will allow for greater control over site selection; criteria should include accessibility to public transport. | ++ | The identification of sites will allow sites to be selected that have good accessibility to public transport. | - | The current need based assessment offers only offers limited scope to influence the physical location of sites. Although policy states that access to the road network will be a consideration, no mention is made of sustainable transport. | -- | Without specific sites designated, gypsies may start to 'tour' the District to identify suitable land. Opportunities to service sites with public transport infrastructure would not be available. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Cites considered on their own merits should allow sites that affects areas of biodiversity to be rejected. | + | This option is likely to allow for greater control over site selection; positive effects will be achieved if there is a criteria protecting biodiversity. | ++ | Identification and allocation of gypsies will allow the Council to protect designated sites from disruption. | - | Existing policy requires justification of need but does not extent to identifying suitable sites and therefore, limited policy intervention could have negative effects on local biodiversity through unregulated sites. | -- | No identification of sites for gypsies may result in them choosing their own sites which may mean disturbing designated sites resulting in negative effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | +/- | The consideration of sites on their merits will allow appropriate mitigation measures to be included to minimise the potential effects on water quality from sanitation. However, Policy may not be strong enough to ensure appropriate sites are considered. | + | Policy will allow for greater control over site selection; criteria should include ability to provide adequate sanitation and minimise effects from surface runoff. | ++ | Identification and allocation of sites will allow for careful monitoring of sanitation and water quality to minimise potential negative effects on water quality. | +/- | Although the current policy includes a needs based assessment, which includes a provision to ensure sites will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining residents; this does not specifically mention water quality. Both positive and negative are effects are possible dependent upon the implementation of the policy. | - | No protection of existing sites through policy intervention will mean that there is no control over sanitation or pollution of local watercourses through careful planning and management. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Acknowledgement of need. Sites considered on their merits. | Option 2 –Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites but do not identify sites. | Option 3 - Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites and identify sites according to criteria. | Option 4 - Existing policy. | Option 5 - Market let / do nothing. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|----|--|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | +/- | The consideration of sites on their merits will allow the selection of sites to be influenced from a flood risk perspective. However, Policy may not be strong enough to ensure appropriate sites are considered. | + | Criteria for such could include consideration of flood risk and therefore direct gypsy sites away from floodplain areas. | ++ | Site criteria and allocation of sites could consider flood risk, with subsequent positive effects on minimising flood risk in the long term. | - | Current policy provides no consideration of flood risk in assessing the need for additional sites. | - | Without specific designation, there is a risk that gypsies may choose to locate in sites that may lead to an increase in flood risk. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Acknowledgement of need. Sites considered on their merits. | | Option 2 –Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites but do not identify sites. | | Option 3 - Acknowledgement of need. Criteria for future sites and identify sites according to criteria. | | Option 4 - Existing policy. | | Option 5 - Market let / do nothing. | |
|---|-----------|--|-----------|---|-----------|--|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | |
| enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table D5: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Location and Scale of Development - Housing Targets

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | | |
|---|-----|---|-----|---|----|---|------|--|-----|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effects |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | Site allocations provide opportunity to ensure that housing development is sited in areas where services and facilities are accessible. | ++ | Site allocations provide opportunity to ensure that housing development is sited in areas where services and facilities are accessible. | ++ | Site allocations provide opportunity to ensure that housing development is sited in areas where services and facilities are accessible. | ++/- | Site allocations provide opportunity to ensure that housing development is sited in areas where services and facilities are accessible. However, high demand for housing land to meet growth target may constrain availability of land for lower value service uses, thus being counterproductive. | 0 | No obvious effect. | -- | In introducing a cap on the development of large housing sites, development pressure from the market is likely to result in a 'race' for completion. This presents the risk of undermining the phasing of sites and may result in the development of less constrained (possibly greenfield) sites in advance of more accessible sites, with likely detrimental effects against the objective. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the | --- | The policy approach provides allocations to 2011 only – this will fail to meet housing needs from 2011-2021. | --- | In allocating sites to accommodate a number of houses below the regional target, the policy option is unlikely to meet identified | ++ | In allocating sufficient housing sites to meet the regional target, the policy option | ++/- | In allocating sufficient housing sites to exceed the regional target, the policy option should provide a choice of sites | --- | Without policy intervention, although market forces are likely to result in some | -- | In linking housing growth to regional targets, the Borough will have less control over the |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|------------------------|--|---|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| quality and affordability of housing | | | | housing needs to 2021. | | should assist in enabling identified housing needs to be met. | | to enable identified housing need to be met. However, if all sites are developed, there is a risk that environmental quality will be adversely affected by ‘cramming’ of built development in the landscape. | | level of house building, it is considered highly likely that affordable housing will be under- represented and overall, the range of housing needs will not be met. | | phasing of housing growth as house builders ‘race’ to develop larger sites. This is likely to lead to imbalanced provision and high market influence, neither of which is likely to contribute to meeting the needs for affordable housing. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | -- | In allocating housing land to meet needs to 2011 only, there is a considerable risk that insufficient housing will be provided to meet needs, which could give rise to housing deprivation and inequality of opportunities, particularly in the medium to longer term. | -- | In allocating insufficient housing sites to meet regional targets, there is a considerable risk that insufficient housing will be provided to meet needs, which could give rise to housing deprivation and inequality of opportunity, particularly in the longer term. | ++ | Allocating sufficient sites to meet the regional target should help to ensure that land is available to provide the requisite amount of new homes, which should help to combat poverty and provide greater equality of opportunities. | +++ | Allocating a larger number of sites than required by the regional target should help to increase choice of housing sites and allow greater flexibility in providing a range of different housing types – potentially this could make a significant contribution to tackling housing deprivation and improving equality of opportunity. | --- | Without policy intervention, although market forces are likely to result in some level of house building, it is considered highly likely that affordable housing will be under- represented and overall, the range of housing needs will not be met. This is likely to contribute to increased housing poverty and inequality of opportunity. | --- | In linking housing growth to regional targets, the Borough will have less control over the phasing of housing growth as house builders ‘race’ to develop larger sites. This is likely to lead to imbalanced provision and high market influence, neither of which is likely to contribute to meeting the housing needs of excluded groups. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|------------------------|---|---|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| behaviour | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | - | In allocating more housing sites than required, there is a risk that environmental quality will be adversely affected as a result of excessive 'cramming' of built development in the landscape. | -- | The economic drivers of market reliance is likely to result in patterns of housing development that favour the more affluent, which presents a considerable risk that inequalities will be increased by this policy option. | -- | In linking the development of large sites to the regional housing targets, the policy option is likely to encourage house builders to prioritise the less constrained sites for development. In practice, these are likely to be greenfield sites and their loss (in advance of more constrained brownfield sites) is likely to have negative effects in terms of reducing the amount of land available for outdoor recreational and sporting pursuits. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | ++ | It is likely that to meet the annual average rate of 180 homes per annum, this can be met on PDL ensuring efficient use of PDL. | - | Potential for inefficient use of land. | +/- | The extent to which the regional house build target can be met through PDL and existing and future allocations is likely to result in overall positive effects. However, this option may result in greenfield development | -- | Likely to result in the need for greenfield development as unlikely than exceeding the regional building target can all be met on PDL | --- | Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to result in some level of house building however; there is no control over location which could result in inefficient use of PDL and buildings in | +/- | The extent to which the regional house build target can be met through PDL and existing and future allocations is likely to result in overall positive effects. However, this option may result in greenfield development resulting in overall |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|------------------------|--|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | | | resulting in overall negative effects. | | | | certain less desirable areas in favour of more desirable greenfield sites. | | negative effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeologica l sites and cultural features of importance to the community | + | To continue to meet current build rate, it is likely this can be met without undue harm to heritage assets. | ++ | Less pressure for housing in existing settlement areas may protect existing historic assets through less traffic and vibration which can have negative effects on historic structures. | +/- | Relatively high target build rate which may increase pressure to build in proximity to heritage assets thus having detrimental effects on local character through potentially unsympathetic design. | -- | Ambitious build rate likely to require considerable number of development sites, increasing likelihood of detrimental effects upon heritage assets across the District. | - | Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to result in some level of house building however, with not policy this may result in negative effects on heritage assets depending on the location attracted by market forces. | +/- | Relatively high target build rate which may increase pressure to build in proximity to heritage assets thus having detrimental effects on local character through potentially unsympathetic design. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | To the extent that with this option, the annual average housing rate is likely to be met on predominately PDL in urban areas, the quality of the landscape will be maintained. | + | Reducing the annual average build rate is likely to guarantee the protection of the countryside and landscape. | -- | This option is likely to result in some greenfield land release through greenfield expansions and as such, is likely to have detrimental effects on the countryside in terms of land take, increased transport and change in local character. | --- | Ambitious build rate would result in extensive greenfield expansion and as such, is likely to have detrimental effects on the countryside in terms of land-take, increased transport and change in character, to a greater extent than option 3. | -- | Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to result in some level of house building however, there is no control over location which could result negative effects on countryside and local landscape as market forces | -- | This option is likely to result in some greenfield land release through greenfield expansions and as such, is likely to have detrimental effects on the countryside in terms of land take, increased transport and change in local character. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | | | | | | | seek more desirable greenfield sites. | | |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | +/- | Brownfield sites and urban infill sites may be important for local biodiversity. However, the extent to which continuing with current build rate means that development in existing settlements areas, means that greenfield sites important for local biodiversity, means overall protection | + | Reducing the build rate target is likely to result in less pressure for intensifying development in settlement areas therefore less pressure to develop sites important for local biodiversity such as brownfield land. | -- | This option is likely to involve greenfield expansion which, dependent on location, could be important for local biodiversity. | --- | This option is likely to involve greenfield expansion which, dependent on location, could be important for local biodiversity, to a greater extent than option 3. | -- | Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to result in some level of house building however, there is no control over location which could result negative effects on areas important for local biodiversity. | -- | This option is likely to involve greenfield expansion which, dependent on location, could be important for local biodiversity. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | - | Exceeding targets may have a detrimental effect on surface and groundwater quality if their capacity to recover is put under pressure | - | Housing may exceed targets causing detrimental effect on surface and groundwater quality if their capacity to recover is put under pressure | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | - | Exceeding targets could have a detrimental effect on water consumption if capacity | - | Housing may exceed targets with detrimental effect on water | 0 | No obvious effect. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|------------------------|---|---|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | | | | | is stretched | | consumption | | |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | +/- | Any development of housing could increase flood risk. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing could increase flood risk. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing could increase flood risk. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing could increase flood risk. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing could increase flood risk. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing could increase flood risk. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | +/- | Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction | +/- | Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | + | Opportunity for low energy building design and provision of renewable energy for domestic fuel. There may be constraints on this arising from the nature of infill and other sites in settlement areas. | +/- | Opportunity for low energy building design and provision of renewable energy for domestic fuel. There may be constraints on this arising from the nature of infill and other sites in settlement areas. | ++ | Opportunity for low energy building design and provision of renewable energy for domestic fuel. The higher the build rate the higher the opportunity to contribute to this objective through the cumulative effect. | ++ | Opportunity for low energy building design and provision of renewable energy for domestic fuel. Higher build rates may present opportunities for more innovative solutions to serve large scale developments with renewable energy. | + | Opportunity for low energy building design and provision of renewable energy for domestic fuel. | + | Opportunity for low energy building design and provision of renewable energy for domestic fuel. |
| 19. To reduce | +/- | Opportunity to reduce per capita waste generation | +/- | Less opportunity to reduce per capita waste | ++/- | Opportunity to reduce per capita | ++/- | Opportunity to reduce per capita waste | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | Option 5 Do nothing | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | | | | | |
|---|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|----|---|-----------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | | |
| the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | | with design and operational incentives to improve waste re-use, recovery and recycling rates. Opportunities for innovative waste assimilation and disposal may be constrained in development within existing settlement areas. | | generation through design however, less waste generated with less homes built per annum. | | waste generation with design and operational incentives to improve waste re-use recovery and recycling rates. Opportunities for innovative waste assimilation and disposal more pronounced with higher build rate, but overall waste produced will be greater. | | generation with design and operational incentives to improve waste re-use recovery and recycling rates. Opportunities for innovative waste assimilation and disposal more pronounced with higher build rate, but overall waste produced will be greater. | | | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | -- | Provision of homes for workers is a fundamental support for a prosperous and balanced economy. Failure to meet projected housing needs beyond 2011 presents a risk to the sustainability of the economy in the medium to longer term. | -- | Provision of homes for workers is a fundamental support for a prosperous and balanced economy. Failure to meet regional housing targets presents a risk to the sustainability of the economy in the longer term, although the effects are likely to be less adverse than in Option 1. | ++ | Provision of homes for workers is a fundamental support for a prosperous and balanced economy. In meeting the projected regional target for site allocations, the policy option should support the objective. | +/- | Provision of homes for workers is a fundamental support for a prosperous and balanced economy. In allocating more sites than required to meet the regional projections, the policy option should serve to secure provision. However, there is a risk that an over-allocation of sites may result in reduced availability of land for other uses, such as economic development, which could be detrimental. | -- | In relying on the market to deliver housing, there is a considerable risk that the economic drivers will result in an approach that favours the affluent. This may result in an imbalanced economy that excludes those with less purchase power, such as young persons including graduates, failing to allow and encourage them to make an active contribution to the | ++/- - | Provision of homes for workers is a fundamental support for a prosperous and balanced economy. The policy option is likely to result in a 'race' to develop housing sites within the plan period – whilst this may result in greater certainty that housing targets will be met, there is a considerable risk that housing growth will fail to match demand (over-provision in the short term, under provision in the longer term) and the |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy position | | Option 2 – Make provision for new housing supply below regional house building target | | Option 3 - Make provision for new housing supply which meets regional house building target | | Option 4 Make provision for new housing supply which exceeds regional house building target | | Option 5 Do nothing | | Option 6 – cap housing growth on large sites once the regional housing target is met | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | | | | | | | local economy. | | full range of housing needs will fail to be met through the heavy reliance on market activity. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | ++/- | In the short term, housing allocations offer the opportunity to ensure development occurs in locations that help to support town centres through proximity/accessibility. Longer term, there is a risk that provision will fail to meet demand, with potential detrimental effects on town centre vitality and viability. | ++/- | In the short to medium term, housing allocations offer the opportunity to ensure development occurs in locations that help to support town centres through proximity/accessibility. Longer term, there is a risk that provision will fail to meet demand, with potential detrimental effects on town centre vitality and viability, albeit to a lesser extent that Option 1. | +++ | The identification of sufficient sites to meet the regional targets through allocations offers the opportunity to ensure that site location seeks to maximise potential benefits to town centres through selection of accessible sites, promoting frequent use of town centres for essential services and facilities, as well as recreation. | ++/- | The identification of a wide range of sites to exceed regional housing targets offers the opportunity to ensure that site location seeks to maximise potential benefits to town centres through selection of accessible sites, promoting frequent use of town centres for essential services and facilities, as well as recreation. However, there is a risk that high development targets may have detrimental effects on town centres arising from 'cramming' of development. | -- | Reliance on the market provides no certainty of how and where housing will be provided. Based on current trends, increased town centre living may have beneficial effects for town centre vitality and viability; however, a shift to out-of- town/ greenfield development would be likely to have detrimental effects. | -- | The introduction of a cap on housing growth in relation to larger sites that, by their very nature, are likely to be outside town centre boundaries, is likely to focus house building activity outside town centres, at least in the short to medium term. This could have detrimental effects on supporting the objective through a reduction in emphasis on town centre living. |

Notes:

- Local Plan Policy H1 makes provision for 180 dwellings p/a through to 2011.
- 4,200 dwellings 2001 to 2021 in draft RSS (210 p/a) was “rounded up” in the recent Panel Report to 5,000 homes over the same period.
- See comments on previous options re. Market led options.

Table D6: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy: Location and scale of development - Retail / Town Centre uses / Boundaries and Frontages

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|---|----|--|----|--|-----|--|----|---|
| Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position. | | Option 2 – Reduce / remove High Street designation in Potters Bar. | | Option 3 - Identify primary and secondary frontages. | | Option 4 - Develop policies for local and neighbourhood centres. | | Option 5 - Do nothing. | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | The policy option includes a sequential approach to the location of town centre uses and should therefore help to concentrate facilities and services in the most accessible locations. | 0 | No effect – the policy option is too locationally specific | ++ | The policy option should help to accommodate retail, services and facilities in the most accessible central locations. | +++ | Policies to strengthen local and neighbourhood centres present opportunities to ensure that essential services and facilities are provided at a local scale. | -- | Reliance upon market forces is likely to result in a decline in the retail and service function of town centres in favour of out-of-town provision and increased leisure and recreation – this is likely to have significant adverse effects against the objective. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position. | Option 2 – Reduce / remove High Street designation in Potters Bar. | Option 3 - Identify primary and secondary frontages. | Option 4 - Develop policies for local and neighbourhood centres. | Option 5 - Do nothing. | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------|---|----|--|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | | | | | | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | By concentrating town centre uses in the most accessible locations current levels of sustainable transport use are likely to be maintained and possibly increased. | 0 | No obvious effects. Policy too specific. | ++ | By concentrating town centre uses in the most accessible locations current levels of sustainable transport use are likely to be maintained and possibly increased. | + | Specific policies for local and neighbourhood centres should support sustainable transport use any levels of use are likely to be maintained or possibly increased. | -- | Removal of designations would result in dispersed development that is less likely to be serviced by sustainable modes of transport. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position. | | Option 2 – Reduce / remove High Street designation in Potters Bar. | | Option 3 - Identify primary and secondary frontages. | | Option 4 - Develop policies for local and neighbourhood centres. | | Option 5 - Do nothing. | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|------------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Current improvements in air quality are likely to continue in town centre locations. | 0 | No obvious effects. Policy too specific. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Current improvements in air quality are likely to continue in town centre locations. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Improvements in air quality are likely in local and neighbourhood centres. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Dispersed development would result in increased car use and potential deterioration in air quality. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport use being maintained or increased will contribute towards decreased greenhouse gas emissions. | 0 | See assessment of SA objective 11. No obvious effects. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport use being maintained or increased will contribute towards decreased greenhouse gas emissions. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport use being maintained or increased will contribute towards decreased greenhouse gas emissions. | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Greenhouse gas emissions are likely to increase through increased vehicle usage from dispersed development. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current policy position. | Option 2 – Reduce / remove High Street designation in Potters Bar. | Option 3 - Identify primary and secondary frontages. | Option 4 - Develop policies for local and neighbourhood centres. | Option 5 - Do nothing. | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------------------|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and recycling of waste | | | | | | | | | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | ++ | The sequential approach of this policy option should help to ensure that complementary retail and service developments are co-located in central locations, which is important in securing a sustainable and prosperous retail/ town centre economy. | + | The policy option is very narrow in focus. However, rationalisation of PB High Street should help to increase the vitality and prosperity of the retail sector of the local economy in this location. | +++ | The policy option should help to support the wider role of town centres, encompassing retail leisure and service uses in a complementary manner. This should help to support the town centre economy, thus contributing to the objective. | +/- | Focusing investment in local and neighbourhood centres should help to strengthen local economies; however, there is a risk that this could be at the expense of the main town centre, with a potentially destabilising effect on this sector of the economy, running counter to the objective. | -- | Reliance upon the market is likely to result in a proliferation of non-A1 uses, a declining retail role and therefore de- stabilisation of this sector of the economy, with significant adverse effects against the objective. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | ++ | The sequential approach of this policy option should help to deliver compact town centres with a strong retail element – this should help to secure vitality and viability. | + | This policy option is very narrow in its geographic focus; however, it should help to support increased vitality and viability in PB through developing a more compact town centre, focusing activity in a smaller but more vibrant area. | +++ | The policy option seeks to strongly support the development of diverse town centres with strong retail cores enveloped in a broader range of leisure and recreational uses. This is the model recognised as delivering vital and viable town centres in the most effective manner. | -- | This policy option does not address town centres and may in fact serve to divert investment away in favour of the local service centres, with detrimental effects against the objective. | --- | Reliance upon the market is likely to result in a proliferation of non-A1 uses, a declining retail role and therefore decline of traditional town centres, with significant adverse effects against the objective. |

Notes:

- Current position largely reflects PPS6, requiring a sequential approach to site selection and a demonstration of need for major development. Policy T3. See also retail hierarchy established in relevant section of the Local Plan.
- "...in the Borough's Town, Local Town and District Centres".

Table D7: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy: Location and Scale of Development - Role of Safeguarded Land

Scale of effect (SE): Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|-----|--|-----|---|-----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Base on Existing Safeguarding Policy | | Option 2 - Review existing areas of designated land, considering releasing some safeguarded areas for development (if needed) | | Option 3 - Do nothing |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | Safeguarding housing sites for the long term presents an opportunity to ensure that they are well related to essential services and facilities, thus supporting the objective. | ++ | The review approach offers the opportunity to ensure that the safeguarded sites that are retained offer good accessibility to essential services and facilities. | -- | Without sites safeguarded for the longer term, there is a risk that housing could be sited in locations offering poor accessibility to essential services and facilities. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | ++ | Safeguarding sites for potential housing development in the longer term should contribute indirectly to enabling the delivery of a wide range of housing. | +/- | The review approach may help to better relate land supply to housing demand; however, there is a risk that the release of safeguarded sites will limit the ability to deliver requisite housing in the longer term. | -- | Without safeguarding sites for the longer term, there is a risk that requisite housing will not be capable of being delivered in the longer term. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Without policy intervention to safeguard sites for housing, there is a risk that the green belt will come under increased pressure for development in the longer term. Loss of green belt land is likely to reduce opportunities for outdoor leisure and recreational pursuits, with potential detrimental effects on health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | +/- | Effects would be dependent on the lifetime of the policy. Extension could protect Greenfield sites. | - | Release of safeguarded areas would reduce the need to develop on previously developed land and could endanger Greenfield sites. | +/- | Termination of safeguarded land may provide more land for housing, prevent this from occurring in Greenfield land but Greenfield land protected by safeguarding could suffer. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing Safeguarding Policy | Option 2 - Review existing areas of designated land, considering releasing some safeguarded areas for development (if needed) | Option 3 - Do nothing | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|--|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity - | +/- | Development on land may reduce previous contamination. However development itself could cause contamination and impact on soil quality and quantity. | +/- | Development on land may reduce previous contamination. However development itself could cause contamination and impact on soil quality and quantity. | + | Development of safeguarded land will not proceed protecting soil quality and quantity. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | +/- | Effects would be dependent on the lifetime of the policy. Extension could protect Greenfield sites. | -- | Release of safeguarded areas could cause disturbance or damage to landscape and sites. | + | Landscape character of currently safeguarded sites will be protected in the long term. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | +/- | Effects would be dependent on the lifetime of the policy. Extension could protect Greenfield sites. | -- | Release of safeguarded areas could cause damage to countryside and landscape. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | +/- | Effects would be dependent on the lifetime of the policy. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects dependent on levels of development forthcoming and public transport accessibility levels. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | +/- | Effects would be dependent on the lifetime of the policy. Extension could protect Greenfield sites. | -- | Release of safeguarded areas could cause damage and disturbance of habitats and wildlife. | ++ | Option likely to protect habitats on safeguarded land from development. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | - | Use of land when appropriate could affect water resources and contaminate surface and ground water, if not properly mitigated | - | Use of land when appropriate could affect water resources and contaminate surface and ground water, if not properly mitigated. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | - | Use of land when appropriate would increase water consumption due to the presence of housing or employment which would both require water. | - | Use of land when appropriate would increase water consumption due to the presence of housing or employment which would both require water. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | - | Flood risk may increase through the development of safeguarded land. | - | Flood risk may increase through the development of safeguarded land. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Use of land when appropriate will increase activity in the area, such as vehicle movements which would impact on air quality. | - | Use of land when appropriate will increase activity in the area, such as vehicle movements which would impact on air quality. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing Safeguarding Policy | | Option 2 - Review existing areas of designated land, considering releasing some safeguarded areas for development (if needed) | | Option 3 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions likely to increase in the long term from development. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions likely to increase. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | ++ | Provision of suitable land for housing is an important element of supporting the economy – safeguarding sites for longer term housing provision should help to support the objective. | +++ | A review approach to the release of safeguarded sites for alternative development, based on an assessment of need, could potentially result in increased opportunities for economic development to be realised. | -- | Without policy intervention to protect safeguarded sites for housing development in the longer term, there is a risk that supply will be overtaken by demand and unsustainable patterns of development will emerge. This could be detrimental to the local economy. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | ++ | The identification of sites for the development of housing in the longer term offers the opportunity to direct development to locations that are well-related to town centres and thus likely to help support vitality and viability. | ++ | The managed release of safeguarded housing sites for alternative forms of development offers the opportunity to ensure that one of the assessment criteria is accessibility to town centres – development in accessible locations is more likely to help support town centre vitality and viability. | -- | Without policy intervention to protect safeguarded sites for housing development in the longer term, there is a risk that supply will be overtaken by demand and unsustainable patterns of development will emerge. This could be detrimental to town centres as dispersed settlement patterns are unlikely to lend support to town centre vitality and viability. |

Table D8: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy: Housing Delivery – Affordable Housing

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position | Option 2 – Lower the trigger threshold | Option 3 - Raise the level of provision on all qualifying sites | Option 4 - Link the level of provision to tenure | Option 5 - Do nothing | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------|---|------|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | ++ | Policy option provides threshold based requirement for % provision of affordable housing as well as permitting rural exceptions – this should assist in achieving the objective. | ++ | As Option 1, but with lower threshold therefore policy option should deliver greater amount of affordable housing on more sites across the District. | ++ | This policy option should result in increased levels of affordable housing on all qualifying sites thus making a significant contribution to the objective | ++/- | In linking provision requirements to specific tenure, the policy option offers greater flexibility and should help to deliver a wider range of affordable housing types. However, there is a risk that developers will favour one type of tenure over others, which could lead to imbalanced supply. | --- | Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to favour market housing over affordable, thus delivery is likely to be poor or non-existent. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | ++ | Availability of housing is an important indicator of poverty and equality – the policy option includes measures to secure provision of a range of affordable housing, including rural exception sites, which should help to support the objective. | ++ | Availability of housing is an important indicator of poverty and equality – the policy option includes measures to secure provision of a range of affordable housing with a lower threshold of qualifying sites, which should help to support the objective. | ++ | Availability of housing is an important indicator of poverty and equality – the policy option includes measures to secure provision of a range of affordable housing at a higher percentage than options 1 and 2, which should help to support the objective. | ++/- | Availability of housing is an important indicator of poverty and equality – the policy option includes measures to secure provision of a range of affordable housing tenures, which should help to support the objective. However, there is a risk that developers will favour one type of tenure over others, which could lead to imbalanced supply and inability of some to access the housing market. | --- | Availability of housing is an important indicator of poverty and equality – without policy intervention, market forces are likely to favour market housing over affordable, thus delivery is likely to be poor or non-existent, with detrimental effects against the objective. |
| 5. To reduce and | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 –Maintain the current position | | Option 2 – Lower the trigger threshold | | Option 3 - Raise the level of provision on all qualifying sites | | Option 4 - Link the level of provision to tenure | | Option 5 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 –Maintain the current position | | Option 2 – Lower the trigger threshold | | Option 3 - Raise the level of provision on all qualifying sites | | Option 4 - Link the level of provision to tenure | | Option 5 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| landscape | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Those on lower income such as key workers who require affordable housing will be more likely to be able to live and work in the same settlement reducing the need to travel | + | Those on lower income such as key workers who require affordable housing will be more likely to be able to live and work in the same settlement reducing the need to travel | + | Those on lower income such as key workers who require affordable housing will be more likely to be able to live and work in the same settlement reducing the need to travel | + | Those on lower income such as key workers who require affordable housing will be more likely to be able to live and work in the same settlement reducing the need to travel | - | Those on lower income such as key workers who require affordable housing will not be able to live and work in the same settlement reducing the need to travel |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to travel between the settlements where they live and work | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to travel between the settlements where they live and work | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to travel between the settlements where they live and work | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to travel between the settlements where they live and work | - | Without the provision of affordable housing for those with low income, they may increase the need o travel between the settlements where they live and work |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to travel between the settlements | + | Provision of affordable housing for those with low income may reduce the need for them to travel between the settlements | - | Without the provision of affordable housing for those with low income, they may increase the |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 –Maintain the current position | Option 2 – Lower the trigger threshold | Option 3 - Raise the level of provision on all qualifying sites | Option 4 - Link the level of provision to tenure | Option 5 - Do nothing | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------|---|------|---|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | travel between the settlements where they live and work | | travel between the settlements where they live and work | | where they live and work | | where they live and work | | need o travel between the settlements where they live and work |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | +++ | Availability of housing for key workers, often on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. The policy option includes provision to deliver a range of affordable housing including rural exceptions, which should help to support the objective. | +++ | Availability of housing for key workers, often on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. This policy option includes provision to deliver affordable housing on a wider range of sites than under Option 1, which should help to support the objective. | ++/- | Availability of housing for key workers, often on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. In raising the level of provision on qualifying sites, more affordable housing may be provided; however, this may have implications for other developer contributions and reduce the ability of the policy to secure other investment to support economic development. | ++/- | Availability of housing for key workers, often on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. The policy option includes measures to secure provision of a range of affordable housing tenures, which should help to support the objective. However, there is a risk that developers will favour one type of tenure over others, which could lead to imbalanced supply and inability of some to access the housing market, with potential detrimental effects against the objective. | --- | Availability of housing for key workers, often on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. Reliance on the market is unlikely to realise delivery of necessary affordable housing, with significant detrimental effects against the objective. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D9: Assessment Of The Range Of Options For Achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Housing Delivery – Elderly Housing

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|----|---|----|---|----|---|
| <p>Option 1 – Introduce specific proactive new policy covering all forms of elderly housing and including definitions</p> <p>Option 2 – Differentiate between sheltered housing/extra care/very sheltered and care/residential homes in terms of suitability in different locations</p> <p>Option 3 – Do nothing</p> | | | | | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | + | Proactive policy approach to provision of housing for elderly should help to improve access to services and facilities for this portion of the population. | ++ | Differential policy should help to ensure improved access to essential services and facilities through appropriate location of housing by housing type for the elderly proportion of the population. | -- | Reliance on the market for the delivery of housing for elderly persons presents the risk that locations will be poorly related to essential services and facilities, with potentially negative effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing need and improve the quality and affordability of housing | + | Proactive policy approach to the provision of a range of different housing for the elderly population should help to significantly improve the quality and availability of housing for this portion of the population. | ++ | Differential policy approach to the provision of specific types of housing for the elderly in pre-planned locations should significantly improve the quality and availability of housing for this portion of the population. | -- | Reliance on the market for the delivery of specialist housing for elderly persons presents a considerable risk that supply will fail to match demand, potentially pricing/forcing this portion of the population out of the housing market. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | + | Proactive policy approach to securing the delivery of a range of housing types suited to the elderly should help to significantly improve opportunities for social integration and equality of opportunity, particularly for those community members wishing to live as independently as practicable. | ++ | Differential policy approach that sets out specific locational and design criteria for the delivery of housing types suited to the elderly should help to significantly improve opportunities for social integration and equality of opportunity, particularly for those community members wishing to live as independently as practicable. | -- | As above – inability to access housing is likely to increase social exclusion within the elderly population. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | + | Proactive policy to secure the delivery of housing types specifically tailored to the needs of the elderly is likely to assist in reducing fear and incidence of crime amongst this section of the population, which is often considered to be more vulnerable. | ++ | Differential policy approach that sets out specific locational and design criteria for the delivery of housing types suited to the elderly should help to assist in reducing fear and incidence of crime amongst this section of the population, which is often considered to be more vulnerable. | -- | Reliance upon the market to accommodate the housing needs of elderly persons presents a risk that provision will not match requirements, potentially contributing to a heightened fear of crime amongst a group that statistically experiences a greater sense of being unsafe. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | + | A proactive approach to the delivery of housing tailored to the needs of the elderly offers the opportunity to reduce inequality in terms of access to housing. | ++ | Differential policy approach that sets out specific locational and design criteria for the delivery of housing types suited to the elderly, in appropriate locations to access | -- | Reliance on the market for the delivery of housing for elderly persons presents the risk that locations will be poorly related to essential services and facilities, with |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Introduce specific proactive new policy covering all forms of elderly housing and including definitions | | Option 2 – Differentiate between sheltered housing/extra care/very sheltered and care/residential homes in terms of suitability in different locations | | Option 3 – Do nothing | |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|--|--------------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | services and facilities, offers the opportunity to significantly reduce inequality amongst the elderly and potentially improve health. | | potentially negative effects. Poor access to services and facilities may in turn translate into poor health and increased inequality. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Introduce specific proactive new policy covering all forms of elderly housing and including definitions | | Option 2 – Differentiate between sheltered housing/extra care/very sheltered and care/residential homes in terms of suitability in different locations | | Option 3 - Do nothing | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--------------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| renewable energy | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | + | A proactive approach to the delivery of housing suited to elderly persons should help to retain this section of the population, which helps to secure a demographically balanced population and support town centre services and facilities and thus vitality and viability. | ++ | Differential policy approach that seeks to balance housing provision with appropriate locations offers the opportunity to ensure that housing is well related spatially to town centres to assist in supporting their services and facilities and thus vitality and viability. | -- | Reliance on the market for the delivery of housing for elderly persons presents the risk that locations will be poorly related to essential services and facilities, with potentially negative effects arising from both out-migration and poor patronage of town centres by this sector of the population. |

Table D10: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Housing Delivery - Housing Mix, Size and Tenure

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position (H7) | Option 2 – be prescriptive on housing size and type | Option 3 - link the number of types required to proposed unit number | Option 4 Market led/do nothing | Option 5 Do nothing | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|------------------------|--|------|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs improve the quality and affordability of housing | + | The policy option includes mechanisms to qualitatively assess the housing mix required on a site by site basis, which could potentially contribute to the objective. | ++ | Specification of housing type and mix with the flexibility for tailored application to specific site conditions should make a significant contribution to achieving the objective. | ++ | Specification of housing type and mix based on a numerical calculation should make a significant contribution to achieving the objective, although it is a less flexible approach than Option 2. | +/-- | The market is economically driven and thus strongly favours the delivery of 'market' housing – while this may include some variety in housing type (i.e. flats, terraces and detached), it is unlikely to deliver affordable housing. | --- | Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism to secure the delivery of housing, regardless of type and quality. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | + | In order to support a diverse population in an inclusive manner, housing provision must match a broad spectrum of needs. The policy option includes a mechanism to secure a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures. | ++ | In order to support a diverse population in an inclusive manner, housing provision must match a broad spectrum of needs. In prescribing housing size and type in a manner that can respond to site characteristics, the policy option should make a significant contribution to the objective. | ++ | In order to support a diverse population in an inclusive manner, housing provision must match a broad spectrum of needs. In prescribing housing size and type in a standardised manner, the policy option should make a significant contribution to the objective. | +/-- | In order to support a diverse population in an inclusive manner, housing provision must match a broad spectrum of needs. Although the market may provide a variety of housing types, it is unlikely to deliver a variety of tenure, which may increase social exclusion. | --- | In order to support a diverse population in an inclusive manner, housing provision must match a broad spectrum of needs. Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism to secure the delivery of housing, regardless of type and quality, which is likely to result in increased inequalities. |

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position (H7) | | Option 2 – be prescriptive on housing size and type | | Option 3 - link the number of types required to proposed unit number | | Option 4 Market led/do nothing | | Option 5 Do nothing | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position (H7) | | Option 2 – be prescriptive on housing size and type | | Option 3 - link the number of types required to proposed unit number | | Option 4 Market led/do nothing | | Option 5 Do nothing | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position (H7) | | Option 2 – be prescriptive on housing size and type | | Option 3 - link the number of types required to proposed unit number | | Option 4 Market led/do nothing | | Option 5 Do nothing | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| emissions | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | + | Availability of housing for the full demographic range, which includes those on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. The policy option provides a mechanism for ensuring that a variety of housing type and tenure is delivered. | ++ | Availability of housing for the full demographic range, which includes those on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. The policy option provides a mechanism for prescribing specific housing sizes and types, in response to site conditions, which should help to support the objective. | ++ | Availability of housing for the full demographic range, which includes those on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. The policy option provides a mechanism for prescribing a standard mix of housing size and type on all sites, which should help to support the objective. | ++/- - | Availability of housing for the full demographic range, which includes those on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. Reliance on the market is likely to result in the delivery of a range of housing types, however, these may not be in the most accessible or suitable locations to support a balanced economy and low income workers are likely to be 'priced out' of the market. | -- | Availability of housing for the full demographic range, which includes those on lower incomes, is an important supporting mechanism for a balanced and prosperous economy. Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism to secure the delivery of housing, regardless of type and quality, which is likely to have adverse effects against the objective. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | + | In assisting the delivery of a range of housing types and sizes, the policy should help to contribute to maintaining | ++ | In assisting the delivery of a range of housing types and sizes, the policy should help to contribute to maintaining demographic diversity, which is important in | ++ | In assisting the delivery of a range of housing types and sizes, the policy should help to contribute to maintaining demographic diversity, | ++/- - | Based on current trends, reliance upon the market is likely to deliver housing in town centres, which may contribute to vitality and viability. However, if the | -- | Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism to secure the delivery of housing, regardless of type and quality, which is likely to have adverse effects |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Maintain the current position (H7) | Option 2 – be prescriptive on housing size and type | Option 3 - link the number of types required to proposed unit number | Option 4 Market led/do nothing | Option 5 Do nothing | | | | |
|------------------|----|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|------------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | | | | |
| | | demographic diversity, which is important in supporting vitality and viability. | | supporting vitality and viability. | | which is important in supporting vitality and viability. | | market demand changes, there is a risk that town centres may suffer decline as population out-migrates. | | against the objective. |

Notes:

- Existing policy is qualitative, seeking to provide a “suitable mix” of residential accommodation. However, contains no quantitative measures / standards through which to demand different unit sizes and types.
- Agree.

Table D11: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Housing Delivery - Retention of Housing

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|---|----|--|-----|---|----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Maintain the Current Policy Position (Policy H6) which prevents net loss of residential accommodation on a site. | | Option 2 – Move to a no net loss approach | | Option 3 - As (2) with exceptions for certain uses Would allow certain key community uses where no other sites/buildings available e.g. doctors/dentists | | Option 4 - Do nothing |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | ++ | The policy option would allow for limited redevelopment of housing to provide community facilities, which may help to support the objective. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | + | In ensuring that there is no net loss of housing arising from site redevelopment, the policy option may make an indirect contribution to the objective. | ++ | In ensuring that all development proposals across the District result in no net loss of housing, the policy option may make an indirect contribution to the objective. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | In permitting exceptional redevelopment of housing to provide community based health care provision, the policy option may help to improve health in certain areas of need. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | ++ | No net loss should prevent the need to develop on Greenfield sites. | ++ | No net loss should prevent the need to develop on Greenfield sites. | +/- | No net loss should prevent the need to develop on Greenfield sites for services and facilities. However it may cause housing to be developed on Greenfield sites. | - | Risk of loss of housing in previously developed land which could lead to development on Greenfield sites. |
| 8. To reduce contamination | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | New development may cause contamination or soil disturbance. | - | New development may cause contamination or soil |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the Current Policy Position (Policy H6) which prevents net loss of residential accommodation on a site. | Option 2 – Move to a no net loss approach | Option 3 - As (2) with exceptions for certain uses Would allow certain key community uses where no other sites/buildings available e.g. doctors/dentists | Option 4 - Do nothing | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and safeguard soil quality and quantity | | | | | | | | disturbance. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Scale of effect dependent upon location of new site and accessibility to sustainable modes of transport. | +/- | Provision of needed services could reduce the need to travel. However future housing may have to be built in Greenfield sites, increasing travel. | +/- | Use of land for services and facilities could reduce the need to travel. However future housing may have to be built in Greenfield sites, increasing travel. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Dependent on the type of development and its effect on water resources. | +/- | Dependent on the type of development and its effect on water resources. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Additional development is likely to increase water consumption. | - | Additional development is likely to increase water consumption. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Dependent on the type of development and impacts on surface permeability | +/- | Dependent on the type of development and impacts on surface permeability |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Air quality effects are related to the related increase in vehicle emissions. | +/- | Provision of needed services may reduce the need to travel and improve air quality. However future housing may be built further away and increase travel | +/- | Use of land for services or facilities may reduce the need to travel and improve air quality. However future housing may be built further away and increase travel |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions | +/- | Provision of needed services may reduce the need to travel. However | +/- | Use of land for services or facilities may reduce the need to. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the Current Policy Position (Policy H6) which prevents net loss of residential accommodation on a site. | Option 2 – Move to a no net loss approach | Option 3 - As (2) with exceptions for certain uses Would allow certain key community uses where no other sites/buildings available e.g. doctors/dentists | Option 4 - Do nothing | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| emissions | | | | are related to the related increase in vehicle emissions. | | future housing may be built further away and increase travel | | However future housing may be built further away and increase travel |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Additional development likely to increase energy demand. | - | Additional development likely to increase energy demand. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Additional development likely to increase waste production. | - | Additional development likely to increase waste production. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D12: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Housing Delivery - Rural Exceptions

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing policy | Option 2 – Do nothing | Option 3 – extend rural exceptions [policy to cover all villages in the borough] |
|---|---|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE Comments/ explanation | SE Comments/ explanation | SE Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | + The policy option permits the development of rural exceptions sites for housing, which is an important mechanism for securing the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas. | -- Without policy intervention, rural housing needs are unlikely to be met due to the constraints of planning policies and lack of market appeal. | +/- The policy option permits the development of rural exception sites in all villages for housing, which is an important mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas. However, rural exceptions housing is meant to be based on evidence of need and there is a risk that site availability may attract market housing, presenting the risk that the policy aim will be undermined. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | ++ The policy option sets out a mechanism for delivering affordable housing in rural areas, which should help to enable less affluent persons to become engaged in rural communities and promote greater equality of access to housing. | -- Without policy intervention, it is likely that housing in rural areas will remain inaccessible to certain less affluent members of the community, which could increase inequalities. | +/- The policy sets out a mechanism for the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas, which should help to enable less affluent persons to become engaged in rural communities and promote greater equality of access to housing. However, in applying the policy to all villages, there is a risk that site availability may attract market housing, presenting the risk that the policy aim will be undermined, leading to further exclusion. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. | 0 No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites -H | + This policy option allows the small scale development in rural areas such as Shenley, South Mimms and Elstree for affordable housing and as such, could contribute to making efficient use of PDL in these areas. | 0 No obvious effects. | + This policy would allow small scale development in all villages in the borough including Aldenham which could contribute to making efficient use of available PDL in these areas. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality | - Rural exceptions may result in slight negative effects through Greenfield | 0 No obvious effects. | -- Rural exceptions across the Borough are likely to have significant negative effects through potential Greenfield development and |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing policy | | Option 2 – Do nothing | | Option 3 – extend rural exceptions [policy to cover all villages in the borough] | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| SA/SEA Objective and quantity | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | development and the loss of agricultural land. | | | | loss of agricultural land. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | - | Potential that allowing small scale development in rural villages may have negative effects on historic buildings through unsympathetic design without the successful implementation on the policy theme protecting historic assets. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Potential that allowing small scale development in rural villages may have negative effects on historic buildings through unsympathetic design without the successful implementation on the policy theme protecting historic assets. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | - | Potential negative effects on the local landscape of rural villages although effects should be minimal. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Potential negative effects on the local landscape of rural villages, to a greater extent than option 1. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | - | Rural exception sites are unlikely to be served by sustainable modes of transport and may result in increased car use. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Rural exception sites are unlikely to be served by sustainable modes of transport and may result in increased car use. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than Option 1. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | - | Potential negative effects on local biodiversity in rural villages depending on the location of the rural exception schemes. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Potential negative effects on local biodiversity in rural villages depending on the location of the rural exception schemes, scale of effect is likely to be greater than option 1. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | - | Rural exception sites may result in increased surface runoff and would require mitigation through the use of SuDS. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Rural exception sites may result in increased surface runoff and would require mitigation through the use of SuDS. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than Option 1. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | - | Rural exception sites would result in increased development that would require mitigation through the requirement for water saving devices etc. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Rural exception sites would result in increased development that would require mitigation through the requirement for water saving devices etc. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than Option 1. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | - | Rural exception sites may increase flood risk dependent on the scale of the development that would require mitigation. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Rural exception sites may increase flood risk dependent on the scale of the development that would require mitigation. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than Option 1. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Additional traffic in rural areas may lead to local deterioration in air quality. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Additional traffic in rural areas may lead to local deterioration in air quality. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than Option 1. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | - | Additional development will have a negative effect on greenhouse gas emissions, unless development is carbon neutral. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Additional development will have a negative effect on greenhouse gas emissions, unless development is carbon neutral. Scale of effect is likely to be greater than Option 1. |
| 18. To minimise the need for | + | Opportunity for low energy building design | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Opportunity for low energy building design and renewable energy |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing policy | | Option 2 – Do nothing | | Option 3 – extend rural exceptions [policy to cover all villages in the borough] | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | | and renewable energy provision with new developments in rural areas. | | | | provision with new developments in rural areas. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | + | Opportunity to reduce per capita waste generation with design. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Opportunity to reduce per capita waste generation with design. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | + | Allowing affordable housing in rural villages may help to support the local economies. | - | Unlikely to support affordable housing for key workers in rural villages which may be detrimental to the economies of these areas. | ++ | Allowing affordable housing in rural villages may help to support the local economies in these villages. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | + | Positive effects as in providing affordable housing in rural villages this may mean that people can live and work nearby which may have knock on effects in sustaining the village centres, limited to Shenley and Elstree. | - | Without policy intervention it is unlikely that rural villages will be supported due to no demand produced from affordable housing development in villages. Could result in dormant commuter villages. | ++ | Positive effects as in providing affordable housing in rural villages this may mean that people can live and work nearby which may have knock on effects in sustaining the village centres across the Borough. |

Table D13: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Delivering Sustainable Communities - Accessible Buildings and Lifetime Homes

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | Option 1 – Maintain current approach for lifetime homes of 10% | | Option 2 – Raise the % of lifetime homes towards 100% | | Option 3 - Lower or remove threshold for lifetime homes | | Option 4 - Introduce a fixed %for wheelchair accessible homes | | Option 5 - Negotiate % for wheelchair accessible depending on need/known occupiers | | Option 6 - Do nothing | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | + | The policy option offers limited opportunity to ensure that a proportion of the housing stock meets the design and quality criteria of the 16 lifetime homes standards, which seeks to ensure that all homes are fully accessible and thus inclusive. | ++ | The policy option provides the mechanism to significantly increase the ability of the housing stock to meet the design and quality criteria of the lifetime homes standards, which seek to ensure all homes are fully accessible and thus inclusive. | - | The removal of the lifetime homes thresholds may result in adverse effects in terms of failing to meet specific housing needs, particularly for the mobility impaired. | +/- | The policy option includes a mechanism to provide homes to meet the needs of those with mobility difficulties, however, there is no guarantee that supply will be matched to demand. | ++ | The policy option includes a mechanism to provide homes to meet the needs of those with mobility difficulties on the basis of specific identified need. | --- | Without policy intervention, it is highly unlikely that the market will deliver homes that serve to meet specific needs in an affordable manner. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | + | The policy option should help to secure limited delivery of homes to meet the needs of certain disadvantaged groups, such as the mobility | ++ | The policy option should help to ensure that an increased amount of homes meet the needs of certain disadvantaged groups, such as the mobility | -- | This policy option offers little or no opportunity to secure the delivery of housing that meets the specialist needs of | +/- | This policy option may help to secure greater inclusiveness for wheelchair bound persons; however, it does not cater for other often | ++/- | This policy option may help to secure greater inclusiveness for wheelchair bound persons on the basis of need; however, it does not | --- | Reliance on the market is unlikely to deliver homes that serve to meet specific needs and may therefore serve to deepen social |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current approach for lifetime homes of 10% | Option 2 – Raise the % of lifetime homes towards 100% | Option 3 - Lower or remove threshold for lifetime homes | Option 4 - Introduce a fixed %for wheelchair accessible homes | Option 5 - Negotiate % for wheelchair accessible depending on need/known occupiers | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | impaired. This may have some benefits in terms of increasing equality of opportunity and reducing social exclusion. | | impaired. This is likely to have some benefits in terms of increasing equality of opportunity and reducing social exclusion. | | certain sectors of the population. As such, it is likely to increase social exclusion and perpetuate inequalities. | | excluded groups (e.g. the visually impaired) and thus may serve to perpetuate inequalities. | | cater for other often excluded groups (e.g. the visually impaired) and thus may serve to perpetuate inequalities. | | exclusion and inequality of opportunity. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Better provision of lifetime homes in all settlements will allow those with disabilities/ mobility problems to live in settlements with best | ++ | Better provision of lifetime homes in all settlements will allow those with disabilities/ mobility problems to live in settlements with best | - | Reduced provision of lifetime homes would not allow those with disabilities/ mobility problems to | ++ | Better provision of lifetime homes in all settlements will allow those with disabilities/ mobility | ++ | Better provision of lifetime homes in all settlements will allow those with disabilities/ mobility | - | Without policy those with disabilities/ mobility problems will not be able to live in settlements with best |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current approach for lifetime homes of 10% | Option 2 – Raise the % of lifetime homes towards 100% | Option 3 - Lower or remove threshold for lifetime homes | Option 4 - Introduce a fixed %for wheelchair accessible homes | Option 5 - Negotiate % for wheelchair accessible depending on need/known occupiers | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|----|--|----|--|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a reduction in the need to travel. | | services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a reduction in the need to travel. Effect likely to be greater than option 1. | | live in settlements with best services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to an increase in the need to travel. | | problems to live in settlements with best services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a reduction in the need to travel. | | problems to live in settlements with best services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a reduction in the need to travel. | | services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a increase in the need to travel |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in need to travel and associated decrease in emissions from vehicles. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in need to travel and associated decrease in emissions from vehicles. Effect likely to be greater than option 1. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible increase in the need to travel and associated increase in vehicle emissions. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in need to travel and associated decrease in emissions from vehicles. Effect likely to be greater than option 1. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in need to travel and associated decrease in emissions from vehicles. Effect likely to be greater than option 1. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible increase in the need to travel and associated increase in vehicle emissions. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | See assessment of SA objective | + | See assessment of SA objective | - | See assessment of | + | See assessment of | + | See assessment of | - | See assessment |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current approach for lifetime homes of 10% | | Option 2 – Raise the % of lifetime homes towards 100% | | Option 3 - Lower or remove threshold for lifetime homes | | Option 4 - Introduce a fixed %for wheelchair accessible homes | | Option 5 - Negotiate % for wheelchair accessible depending on need/known occupiers | | Option 6 - Do nothing | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel. | | 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel. | | SA objective 11. Possible increase in the need to travel. | | SA objective 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel. | | SA objective 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel. | | of SA objective 11. Possible increase in the need to travel. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Notes:
Lifetime Homes meet a set of standards advocated by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which help to ensure that homes can be easily adapted for use by the disabled / mobility impaired. E.g. level access, sufficient space within the layout to allow a wheelchair to manoeuvre etc. Current Policy (H15) seeks provision (usually in the order of 10%) on all major dwelling developments.

Table D14: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy: Delivering Sustainable Communities –Sustainable Design and Construction

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| Option 1 – General policy promoting good and sustainable design/construction, relating to Planning and Design Guide | | Option 2 – As above but also specifically relating to HCC Guide | | Option 3 - Specific sustainability requirements for certain types of development | | Option 4 - An overarching residential density policy including parameters for flats in residential areas (H9) | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|---|-----|--|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| Social | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | ++ | General policy should help to secure improved design quality in all development, including housing. | ++ | Policy option should help to secure improved design quality that relates to local context, contributing to this element of the objective. | ++ | Specific prescriptive policy offers the opportunity to secure much improved design quality in all types of development, including housing. | --- | Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism to secure set design standards and thus improve quality. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | +++ | The policy option offers the opportunity to realise health benefits through specification of sustainable construction practices and 'healthier' buildings. | +++ | As Option 1. | +++ | As Option 2. | -- | A lack of policy intervention offers no mechanism to secure more sustainable construction and design – the continuation of existing practices and material use may therefore result in |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – General policy promoting good and sustainable design/construction, relating to Planning and Design Guide | Option 2 – As above but also specifically relating to HCC Guide | Option 3 - Specific sustainability requirements for certain types of development | Option 4 - An overarching residential density policy including parameters for flats in residential areas (H9) | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|------|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | | | | | adverse effects against the objective. |
| Environmental | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | ++ | Opportunity to encourage developments to be sympathetic towards heritage assets relating to Planning and Design Guide. | ++ | Opportunity to encourage developments to be sympathetic towards heritage assets relating to Planning and Design Guide and HCC Guide therefore greater positive effects through a hierarchy of guidance. | + | It is likely that specific policy to certain developments will be too inflexible to ensure that heritage assets are protected and enhanced in all cases. | - | Potentially detrimental to heritage assets as this policy option will result in reliance on market offering less opportunity to encourage sympathetic design. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Ensuring high standards of development will ensure that the development is in keeping with the local landscape. | ++ | Ensuring high standards of development will ensure that the development is in keeping with the local landscape. Greater positive effects than with option 1 as this option would result in a hierarchy of policy to ensure good design. | ++/- | Ensuring high standards of development will ensure that the development is in keeping with the local landscape. This policy option will provide stricter control through specific local standards but not in all cases. | -- | With this policy option there is the potential for poor design in new development which will harm local character. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | See assessment of SA objective 6. Lack of guidance may result in increased car usage through development in less accessible locations. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – General policy promoting good and sustainable design/construction, relating to Planning and Design Guide | | | Option 2 – As above but also specifically relating to HCC Guide | | | Option 3 - Specific sustainability requirements for certain types of development | | | Option 4 - An overarching residential density policy including parameters for flats in residential areas (H9) | | |
|--|----|---|--|--|------|---|-----|--|---|--|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | | | |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | | | |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Planning and Design Guide encourages the use of SuDS with positive effects on water quality. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | + | HCC Guide includes guidance on SuDS. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | ++/- | Specific sustainability requirements likely to have a significant positive effect on water quality on developments where the policy is applied. No improvements will be achieved in smaller developments. Suggest apply policy to all developments. | -- | Lack of guidance likely to have a detrimental effect on water quality. | | | |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | + | Planning and Design Guide encourages minimisation of water. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | + | HCC Guide encourages minimisation of water. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | ++/- | Beneficial effects dependent on the nature of sustainable requirements. No improvements will be achieved in smaller developments. Suggest apply policy to all developments. | -- | Lack of guidance likely to increase water consumption from new development. | | | |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | + | Sustainable design/construction should assist in reducing flood risk. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | + | Good and sustainable design/construction should assist in reducing flood risk. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | ++/- | Requirements will help to reduce flood risk for some developments. Flood risk will not be considered in smaller developments. Suggest apply policy to all developments. | -- | Lack of guidance on SuDS likely to increase surface runoff with consequent negative effects on flood risk. | | | |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Sustainable design/construction should assist in improving indoor air quality. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | + | Good and sustainable design/construction should assist in improving indoor air quality. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | ++/- | Requirements will improve indoor air quality significantly for new developments. Flood risk will not be considered in smaller developments. Suggest apply policy to all developments. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Emissions for vehicles likely to increase with negative effects on air quality. | | | |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Good and sustainable design/construction should assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions through better energy efficiency and use of sustainable materials. Scale of | + | Good and sustainable design/construction should assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions through better energy efficiency and use of sustainable materials. Scale of | ++ | Requirements may help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in larger developments and policy may benefit from economies of scale | +/- | National government policy will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but has no local focus. | | | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – General policy promoting good and sustainable design/construction, relating to Planning and Design Guide | | | Option 2 – As above but also specifically relating to HCC Guide | | | Option 3 - Specific sustainability requirements for certain types of development | | | Option 4 - An overarching residential density policy including parameters for flats in residential areas (H9) |
|--|----|---|----|---|--|---|----|--|----|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | |
| | | positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | | positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | | on larger development sites. | | | | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | + | Option encourages energy efficiency and renewable energy in new development. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | + | Option encourages energy efficiency and renewable energy in new development. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | ++/- | This policy option supports the BREEAM and Eco-standards approach to promoting good and sustainable design in new developments. Smaller developments may be exempt from requirements. | - | Market led approach unlikely to result in improvement in energy efficiency and renewable energy use. | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | + | Option encourages waste minimisation in new development. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the Planning and Design Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | + | Option encourages waste minimisation in new development. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements. | ++/- | This policy option supports the BREEAM and Eco-standards approach to promoting good and sustainable design in new developments. Smaller developments may be exempt from requirements. | - | Market led approach unlikely to result in waste minimisation. | | | |
| Economic | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | + | The promotion of sustainable building practices may have some benefits in terms of increased demand for locally sourced products and building materials, which could help to support the economy. | + | As Option 1. | + | As Option 1. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | | |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | | |

Table D15: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Delivering Sustainable Communities

– Flood Risk

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | Option 1 – No development in the floodplain | | Option 2 – No development in the floodplain unless flood prevent/mitigation as required by Env Agency | | Option 3 - Specific requirements regardless of location to reduce flood risk across Hertsmere (e.g. SUDS/permeable surfaces) | | Option 4 Rely on sustainable water use module in HCC Building Futures Guide | | Option 5 Do nothing | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|------------------------|--|
| | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | +/- | May have negative effects on reducing the amount of land available for development; however dwellings will be protected from the negative effects of flooding. | + | Will allow a greater level of development than option 1 however dwellings will be 'flood protected'. | +/- | Will allow a greater level of development; however dwellings may still be at risk from flood events. | - | Dwellings are likely to be at risk from flooding due to unenforceable guidance. | -- | New developments will be at serious risk from flooding with negative effects on housing quality. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – No development in the floodplain | Option 2 – No development in the floodplain unless flood prevent/mitigation as required by Env Agency | Option 3 - Specific requirements regardless of location to reduce flood risk across Hertsmere (e.g. SUDS/permeable surfaces) | Option 4 Rely on sustainable water use module in HCC Building Futures Guide | Option 5 Do nothing | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|------------------------|--|----|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| social behaviour | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | +++ | By precluding development in the flood plain, the policy option should help to safeguard against the adverse health effects of flood events. | ++ | The policy option adopts a precautionary approach to development in the flood plain, permitting it only if mitigation is put in place. This should help to safeguard against the adverse health effects of flood events. | +/- | A whole catchment approach to the limiting of flood risk should help to significantly reduce the risk of flooding, thus helping to safeguard against the adverse health effects of such events with positive effects. However, the option does not preclude development on floodplains which may have the potential for negative health effects. | - | HCC Guide does not provide strong guidance on flooding and would not minimise health risks associated with flooding. | --- | Without policy intervention, there is an elevated likelihood of flooding, which has attendant health risks in terms of waterborne diseases and the mixing of sewage with freshwater supplies. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | -- | Restrictions on development in the floodplain may result in inefficient use of PDL. | - | Restrictions on development in the floodplain may result in inefficient use of PDL. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | May result in efficient use of land if no restrictions over development in the floodplain. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | + | Reducing flood risk would reduce the loss and deterioration of soil caused by flooding. | + | Reducing flood risk would reduce the loss and deterioration of soil caused by flooding. | + | Reducing flood risk would reduce the loss and deterioration of soil caused by flooding. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Flooding could both lead to contamination of soils and loss or deterioration of soil quality. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality | ++ | No development in the floodplain may | + | No development in the floodplain may indirectly | - | Flood prevention measures, depending on nature may have | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | No policy intervention to restrict development in |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – No development in the floodplain | Option 2 – No development in the floodplain unless flood prevent/mitigation as required by Env Agency | Option 3 - Specific requirements regardless of location to reduce flood risk across Hertsmere (e.g. SUDS/permeable surfaces) | Option 4 Rely on sustainable water use module in HCC Building Futures Guide | Option 5 Do nothing | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|------------------------|---|----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| of countryside and landscape | | indirectly allow the protection of the landscape in floodplain areas. | | allow the protection of the landscape in floodplain areas. | | negative effects on local landscape. | | | | floodplains may have indirect negative effects in eroding local landscape. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | ++ | No development in the floodplain which can be important areas for flora and fauna is likely to result in overall positive effects. | ++ | No development in the floodplain which can be important areas for flora and fauna is likely to result in overall positive effects. Flood mitigation can also benefit local biodiversity. | + | Specific requirements to reduce flood risk, such as flood attenuation schemes, can be of benefit to local biodiversity. | + | Sustainable water use may have indirect benefits of biodiversity which rely on water resources. | -- | No policy intervention to restrict development in floodplain may result in overall negative effects for local biodiversity. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Preventing development in flood plains will prevent/reduce the risk of surface and groundwater pollution during flooding. | + | Preventing inappropriate development in flood plains will prevent/reduce the risk of surface and groundwater pollution during flooding | + | Use of systems such as SUDS and permeable surfaces would introduce an extra stage of filtering, reducing surface and groundwater pollution. | + | Some beneficial effects, although option does not provide strong policy basis. | - | No policy intervention to restrict development in floodplain may result in overall negative effects on water quality from flooding and sewage flooding. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | May result in efficient use of land if no restrictions over development in the floodplain. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | +++ | Preventing development in the flood plain will completely reduce flood risk | ++ | Preventing development or mitigating against flooding should minimise any risk | + | Implementation of any requirements will reduce the flood risk. | + | Suggested solutions in the HCC Guide would reduce flood risk when implemented, although policy will not provide a great degree of certainty. | -- | Highly conflicting. The absence of a policy will allow flooding to continue and worsen with the impacts of climate change. |
| 16. To improve local air | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – No development in the floodplain | Option 2 – No development in the floodplain unless flood prevent/mitigation as required by Env Agency | Option 3 - Specific requirements regardless of location to reduce flood risk across Hertsmere (e.g. SUDS/permeable surfaces) | Option 4 Rely on sustainable water use module in HCC Building Futures Guide | Option 5 Do nothing | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|------------------------|--|----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| quality | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re- use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | +++ | Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. Safeguarding against flood risk should indirectly help to support the objective. | +++ | Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. Safeguarding against flood risk should indirectly help to support the objective. | ++ | Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. Adopting a whole catchment approach to the reduction of flood risk should help to support the objective, albeit indirectly. | + | Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. Contributing to safeguarding against flood risk should help to support the objective indirectly. See assessment of SA objective 15 as removal of flood risk with this option is not a certainty. | -- | Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. In failing to provide a policy intervention, the risk of flooding is elevated, with potentially adverse effects for the economy. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

[SLW1] – Building Futures is the HCC Sustainable Design Guide (Also referred to in sustainable design & construction options)

Table D16: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy: Delivering Sustainable Communities - Provision of Community and Leisure Facilities

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|----|---|----|--|-----|---|----|--|----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Protection of existing facilities at all costs | | Option 2 – Support for redevelopment for community use if residential use is retained on site or in vicinity | | Option 3 – Loss of residential permitted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. PCT demonstrate deficiency of GP/dentists) | | Option 4 - Pro-active support for new uses | | Option 5 – Release of surplus/unused sites, subject to all users of a building/site being accommodated within vicinity | | Option 6 – Do nothing |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | + | Community facilities can be important venues for education and training courses, particularly adult learning. Their protection should contribute to the objective. | ++ | The policy option permits the use of vacant sites for redevelopment to meet community needs. This offers the potential to contribute to the objective by providing additional venues for education and training, accessible to community members. | 0 | No effect – the policy option is concerned primarily with delivery of health care services. | ++ | The policy option lends strong support to the provision of new facilities which offers the potential to contribute to the objective by providing additional venues for education and training. | - | Community facilities can be important venues for education and training courses. The policy option supports the redevelopment of such sites for alternative uses and, as such, their loss would run counter to the objective. | -- | Without policy intervention it is likely not only that new provision would not be forthcoming, but also that development pressure would result in the loss of existing community facilities. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | + | The policy option seeks to protect all existing facilities from development. This should help to maintain accessibility of services and facilities to residents. | ++ | As option 1, although this option also seeks additional provision through conversion in residential areas, which should assist in increasing the overall accessibility and availability of services and facilities to residents. | + | This policy option permits the conversion of residential premises to essential health care facilities where there is identified need – this should help to improve accessibility in certain areas. | +++ | The pro-active policy approach should both maintain existing and create new facilities and services. Addition provision should help to secure better availability and accessibility of services to a wider section of the population. | - | Release of sites on the basis of low demand will reduce the overall accessibility of essential services and facilities with particularly acute detrimental effects in certain areas (i.e. the user groups of closed facilities). This would fail to support the objective. | -- | Without policy intervention it is likely not only that new provision would not be forthcoming, but also that development pressure would result in the loss of existing community facilities. This would therefore reduce overall accessibility. |
| 3. To improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | The release of surplus and unused sites for other uses potentially housing is likely to contribute to meet identified housing needs. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Protection of existing facilities at all costs | Option 2 – Support for redevelopment for community use if residential use is retained on site or in vicinity | Option 3 – Loss of residential permitted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. PCT demonstrate deficiency of GP/dentists) | Option 4 - Pro-active support for new uses | Option 5 – Release of surplus/unused sites, subject to all users of a building/site being accommodated within vicinity | Option 6 – Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|----|--|------|--|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | + | Community and leisure facilities are important hubs for social engagement. The policy option seeks to protect existing provision, which should contribute to the objective. | ++ | Community and leisure facilities are important hubs for social engagement. The policy option seeks to retain existing facilities and achieve additional provision through conversion in areas with a high residential catchment, which should help to support the objective. | + | Community and leisure facilities are important hubs for social engagement. The policy option is concerned with securing the delivery of health care through residential conversion in areas of identified need. This should contribute in part to the objective. | ++ | Community and leisure facilities are important hubs for social engagement. In adopting a pro-active approach to securing additional provision, the policy option should make a significant contribution to the objective. | +/-- | Community and leisure facilities are important hubs for social engagement. The policy option seeks to rationalise provision. This includes a mechanism to ensure users can be accommodated elsewhere; however, overall the loss of facilities is likely to have negative effects against the objective. | -- | Community and leisure facilities are important hubs for social engagement. Without policy intervention there is no mechanism for securing community and leisure facilities, which are therefore likely to be lost to development pressure. This loss would fail to support the objective. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | + | 'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities such as anti-social behaviour and social disorder. Community and leisure facilities can play a crucial role in combating this type of crime and the policy option is therefore likely to support the objective. | + | 'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities such as anti-social behaviour and social disorder. Community and leisure facilities can play a crucial role in combating this type of crime and the policy option, which seeks to increase provision, is therefore likely to support the objective. | 0 | No effect – the policy option is concerned with health care provision as opposed to leisure facilities. | ++ | 'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities such as anti-social behaviour and social disorder. Community and leisure facilities can play a crucial role in combating this type of crime and the policy option, which actively seeks to increase provision, is therefore likely to support the objective. | - | 'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities such as anti-social behaviour and social disorder. Community and leisure facilities can play a crucial role in combating this type of crime – in supporting the rationalisation of such facilities, the policy option is likely to have localised adverse effects against the objective. | -- | 'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities such as anti-social behaviour and social disorder. Community and leisure facilities can play a crucial role in combating this type of crime; however, without policy intervention there is no mechanism for safeguarding or increasing provision, which is likely to have significant adverse effects. |
| 6. To improve population's | 0 | No effect – maintaining existing provision is unlikely | + | The policy option includes a mechanism for additional | +++ | The policy option supports the targeted delivery of | ++ | The policy option includes a mechanism for the | - | The policy option supports the rationalisation of | -- | Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism for |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Protection of existing facilities at all costs | Option 2 – Support for redevelopment for community use if residential use is retained on site or in vicinity | Option 3 – Loss of residential permitted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. PCT demonstrate deficiency of GP/dentists) | Option 4 - Pro-active support for new uses | Option 5 – Release of surplus/unused sites, subject to all users of a building/site being accommodated within vicinity | Option 6 – Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|----|---|-----|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | | to improve health over the current baseline. | | community facilities, which may include health care and additional sporting/leisure opportunities. | | primary health care services in areas of demonstrable need. This should have beneficial effects. | | pro-active provision of additional facilities, which may include health care, sporting and leisure opportunities. | | community facilities. As this may involve the loss of health care, sporting and leisure opportunities, the policy option is considered likely to have adverse effects. | | safeguarding or increasing provision of community, sporting and leisure facilities. It is likely, therefore, that provision will be lost to development pressure, which could have significant adverse effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | - | May result in inefficient use of land and buildings with a strict policy resisting the loss of all community facilities if they are underused due to being in the wrong location. | + | Support for redevelopment is likely to ensure buildings are used efficiently. | + | This policy allows the loss of residential buildings for community uses. Recycling of buildings is likely to support this objective. | ++ | Pro-active re-use for new uses may result in making the efficient use of land and buildings. | +++ | The reuse of surplus of under used sites for redevelopment is likely to make efficient use of land and buildings which otherwise, with a strict policy resisting loss of community facilities, may be left redundant representing an inefficient use of land and buildings. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural | 0 | No obvious effect as this option seeks the protection of existing facilities. | - | Redevelopment of sites may result in negative effects on the setting of historic buildings nearby through unsympathetic design. | 0 | Conversion of residential buildings into community facilities is unlikely to effect historic buildings. | - | Pro-active reuse of buildings may have negative effects on the setting of historic buildings. | -- | Re-use of surplus/unused sites may result in pressure for redevelopment of sites which could have negative effects on local character or the setting of historic buildings through | -- | Market forces are likely to result in pressure for the redevelopment of certain facilities and services over time which may result in detrimental effects on historic buildings. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Protection of existing facilities at all costs | | Option 2 – Support for redevelopment for community use if residential use is retained on site or in vicinity | | Option 3 – Loss of residential permitted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. PCT demonstrate deficiency of GP/dentists) | | Option 4 - Pro-active support for new uses | | Option 5 – Release of surplus/unused sites, subject to all users of a building/site being accommodated within vicinity | | Option 6 – Do nothing | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| features of importance to the community | | | | | | | | | | unsympathetic design. | | |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Existing facilities are likely to be served by sustainable modes of transport. | - | Residential sites may be developed that may not be easily accessed by public transport. Effect dependent of location of conversion. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects depending on proximity to sustainable modes of transport. Exceptional circumstances could include criteria for accessibility. | ++ | New uses are likely to be promoted in town centre locations which are likely to more easily accessed by sustainable modes of transport. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects depending on proximity to sustainable modes of transport. | - | Loss of community facilities (potentially to residential uses) has the potential to increase vehicle use and congestion. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Protection of existing facilities at all costs | | Option 2 – Support for redevelopment for community use if residential use is retained on site or in vicinity | | Option 3 – Loss of residential permitted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. PCT demonstrate deficiency of GP/dentists) | | Option 4 - Pro-active support for new uses | | Option 5 – Release of surplus/unused sites, subject to all users of a building/site being accommodated within vicinity | | Option 6 – Do nothing | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| consumption | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Use of existing facilities and sustainable modes of transport has the potential to improve local air quality through less vehicle emissions. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increase vehicle usage may result in negative effects on air quality. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Potential for negative and positive effects dependent on increase in vehicle use and associated emissions. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Vehicle use is likely to be low compared to other options due to sustainable location of new uses in town centres. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Potential for negative and positive effects dependent on increase in vehicle use and associated emissions. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Current levels of greenhouse gas emissions are likely to be maintained or potentially reduced through continued use of sustainable locations. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Additional vehicle use likely to increase greenhouse gas emissions. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Effect on greenhouse gas emissions dependent on levels of additional vehicle usage. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Support for sustainable locations likely to maintain or potentially reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To be truly carbon neutral new developments should be required to be carbon neutral. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Effect on greenhouse gas emissions dependent on levels of additional vehicle usage. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Protection of existing facilities at all costs | | Option 2 – Support for redevelopment for community use if residential use is retained on site or in vicinity | | Option 3 – Loss of residential permitted in exceptional circumstances (e.g. PCT demonstrate deficiency of GP/dentists) | | Option 4 - Pro-active support for new uses | | Option 5 – Release of surplus/unused sites, subject to all users of a building/site being accommodated within vicinity | | Option 6 – Do nothing | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| renewable energy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. | 0 | No obvious effect. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D17: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Delivering Sustainable Communities - s106s/tariffs

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|-----|---|----|--|-----|---|-----|--|-----|---|
| Option 1 – Maintain the current position | | Option 2 – A tariff based approach for all applications | | Option 3 - A tariff based approach for applications above a threshold | | Option 4 - Unilateral undertakings below a certain threshold | | Option 5 - Tariffs for all applications below a certain threshold and s106s for very large schemes | | Option 6 - Do nothing | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No effect – current approach does not appear to include payment for educational provision. | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for educational provision. | ++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that developers making larger applications are required to make financial contributions, which could be used to fund educational provision. | +/- | Unilaterals are not enforceable through planning policy thus there is a risk that benefits may not be realised. However, there is the potential to use unilaterals to fund educational provision. | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for educational provision. Presumably this would reflect the scale of development. | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in necessary services and facilities is lost. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | The policy approach includes provisions to seek commuted payment for transport, affordable housing and recreational provision – this offer opportunities to negotiate improvements in accordance with the objective. | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for a number of measures to support the objective. | ++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that developers making larger applications are required to make financial contributions, which could provide funds for a number of measures to support the objective. | +/- | Unilaterals are not enforceable through planning policy thus there is a risk that benefits may not be realised. However, there is the potential to use unilaterals to fund a number of measures to support the objective. | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for a number of measures to support the objective. Presumably this would reflect the scale of development | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in necessary services and facilities is lost. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of | ++ | The policy option includes provision to seek developer contributions/commuted payments for the provision of affordable housing, which should contribute to the | ++ | The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the tariff approach | ++ | The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the tariff approach could be | + | The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the unilateral approach | ++ | The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the tariff approach could be | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help secure affordable |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position | Option 2 – A tariff based approach for all applications | Option 3 - A tariff based approach for applications above a threshold | Option 4 - Unilateral undertakings below a certain threshold | Option 5 - Tariffs for all applications below a certain threshold and s106s for very large schemes | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|----|---|-----|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| housing | | objective. | | could be used as a means of requiring developers to incorporate provision. | | used as a means of requiring developers to incorporate provision. | | could be used as a means of requiring developers to incorporate provision. Unilaterals offer less certainty than tariffs/s106. | | used as a means of requiring developers to incorporate provision. | | housing provision is lost. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | ++ | The policy approach includes provisions to seek commuted payment for transport, affordable housing and recreational provision – this offer opportunities to negotiate funds to deliver improvements to tackle social exclusion in terms of improved accessibility, housing availability and services/facilities. | ++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for a number of measures to support the objective. | ++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that developers making larger applications are required to make financial contributions, which could provide funds for a number of measures to support the objective. | + | Unilaterals are not enforceable through planning policy thus there is a risk that benefits may not be realised. However, there is the potential to use unilaterals to fund a number of measures to support the objective. | ++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for a number of measures to support the objective. Presumably this would reflect the scale of development | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in necessary services and facilities is lost. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | The policy approach includes provisions to seek commuted payments for transport and recreational provision – this may indirectly help to improve access to health care, sporting and leisure facilities for a wider proportion of the population. | +++ | Tariffs on all development could be used to deliver community health care, sporting and leisure provision, which would contribute to the objective. | ++ | Tariffs on larger development could be used to deliver community health care, sporting and leisure provision, which would contribute to the objective. | + | Unilaterals are not enforceable, but assuming that they were agreed, funds could be used to provide community health care, sporting and/or leisure provision, which would contribute to the objective. | +++ | Developer contributions (tariffs or S106) from all development could be used to deliver community health care, sporting and leisure provision, which would contribute to the objective. | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in necessary services and facilities is lost. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position | Option 2 – A tariff based approach for all applications | Option 3 - A tariff based approach for applications above a threshold | Option 4 - Unilateral undertakings below a certain threshold | Option 5 - Tariffs for all applications below a certain threshold and s106s for very large schemes | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|-----|---|-----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal | + | Contributions towards sustainable transport are possible under the present policy but are limited to those services affected as a result of | +++ | A tariff based approach is likely to generate sufficient funding to enhance | ++ | Similar effect to option 2, however the effect will be of a smaller magnitude as levels of funding | +/- | Unilaterals are not enforceable through planning policy thus there is a risk that benefits may not be | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial | -- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position | Option 2 – A tariff based approach for all applications | Option 3 - A tariff based approach for applications above a threshold | Option 4 - Unilateral undertakings below a certain threshold | Option 5 - Tariffs for all applications below a certain threshold and s106s for very large schemes | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|-----|--|-----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| shift to more sustainable transport modes | | the development. | | sustainable transport options across the District. | | for sustainable transport provision will not be as large. | | realised. However, there is the potential to use unilaterals to fund sustainable transport provision. | | contributions, which could provide funds for sustainable transport provision. Presumably this would reflect the scale of development. | | public transport provision is lost. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Contributions towards biodiversity enhancements are possible under the current policy position. | +++ | Tariffs would enable the enhancement of habitats District wide. | ++ | Tariffs would enable the enhancement of habitats District wide, although not to the same extent as option 2. | +/- | Unilaterals are not enforceable and would not provide certainty in delivering additional habitats, although some enhancements are possible. | +++ | Likely to achieve enhancement of habitats across the District. | - | Opportunity to enhance habitats would be lost. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Contributions towards sustainable transport are possible under the present policy but are limited to facilities affected as a result of the development. | +++ | Tariff based approach is likely to fund waste water infrastructure improvements across the District. | ++ | Tariff based approach is likely to fund waste water infrastructure improvements across the District, however level of improvements will not be the same as option 2. | +/- | Unilaterals are not enforceable through planning policy thus there is a risk that benefits may not be realised. However, there is the potential to use unilaterals to fund improvements to waste water infrastructure. | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for waste water infrastructure provision. Presumably this would reflect the scale of development | -- | Opportunity to invest in improving waste water infrastructure (with associated improvements in water quality) is lost. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account | + | Contributions towards improvements to flood defences are possible under | +++ | Tariff based approach is likely to flood defence | ++ | Tariff based approach is likely to fund waste water | +/- | Unilaterals are not enforceable through planning policy thus | +++ | Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all | -- | Opportunity to improve flood defences through |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position | Option 2 – A tariff based approach for all applications | Option 3 - A tariff based approach for applications above a threshold | Option 4 - Unilateral undertakings below a certain threshold | Option 5 - Tariffs for all applications below a certain threshold and s106s for very large schemes | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|----|--|-----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| of climate change | | the present policy but are limited to areas affected as a result of the development. | | improvements across the District. | | infrastructure improvements across the District, however level of improvements will not be the same as option 2. | | there is a risk that benefits may not be realised. However, there is the potential to use unilaterals to fund improvements to flood defences. | | applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for flood defences. Presumably this would reflect the scale of development | | development would be lost. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Slight improvements in air quality are likely through the current policy position. | +++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Improvements in air quality are likely through additional sustainable transport provision and reduction in emissions. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Improvements in air quality are likely through additional sustainable transport provision and reduction in emissions. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. There is potential for slight improvements in air quality through additional sustainable transport provision, although the delivery of sustainable transport infrastructure cannot be guaranteed to same extent as option 2 and 3. | +++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Improvements in air quality are likely through additional sustainable transport provision and reduction in emissions. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Opportunities for improvements to air quality may be lost. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions may decrease in line with uptake of sustainable modes of transport. | +++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions may decrease in line with uptake of sustainable modes of transport. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions may decrease in line with uptake of sustainable modes of transport. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions may decrease in line with uptake of sustainable modes of transport. | +++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions may decrease in line with uptake of sustainable modes of transport. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions may decrease in line with uptake of sustainable modes of transport. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain the current position | Option 2 – A tariff based approach for all applications | Option 3 - A tariff based approach for applications above a threshold | Option 4 - Unilateral undertakings below a certain threshold | Option 5 - Tariffs for all applications below a certain threshold and s106s for very large schemes | Option 6 - Do nothing | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|--|----|---|----|---|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| to increase the use of renewable energy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | ++ | The policy option includes specific provision to secure commuted payment in respect of transport improvements, which could indirectly help to support the economy. | ++ | Tariffs could be used to support transport improvements, which could indirectly help to support the economy. | + | Tariffs could be used to support transport improvements, which could indirectly help to support the economy. | + | Unilaterals, if received, could be used to support transport improvements, which could help to support the economy. | ++ | Developer contributions could be used to secure transport improvements, which could indirectly help to support the economy. | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in necessary infrastructure is lost. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | + | As above – accessibility is important in promoting town centre use and thus vitality and viability. | ++ | As above – accessibility is important in promoting town centre use and thus vitality and viability. | + | As above – accessibility is important in promoting town centre use and thus vitality and viability. | + | As above – accessibility is important in promoting town centre use and thus vitality and viability. | ++ | As above – accessibility is important in promoting town centre use and thus vitality and viability. | --- | Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in necessary infrastructure is lost. |

Table D18: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Transport - Residential Parking Standards

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|-----|--|----|---|-----|---|-----|--|
| | | Option 1 – Introduce maximum residential standard but assume high demand/car ownership across borough in setting levels | | Option 2 – Introduce maximum residential standard but assume lower demand/car ownership in areas of highest accessibility and smaller unit sizes (as per H14) | | Option 3: Existing policy approach | | Option 4 - Do Nothing |
| Social | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | +/- | The policy option would support improved availability of car parking; however, this may be at the expense of provision for more sustainable modes, thus adversely affecting accessibility for those without a car. | ++ | Differential standards based on accessibility should help to support the objective | +/- | The policy option of minimum standards would support improved availability of car parking; however, this may be at the expense of provision for more sustainable modes, thus adversely affecting accessibility for those without a car. | +/- | Although this option is likely to reduce car reliance and encourage modal shift through necessity, it also fails to provide a mechanism to pro-actively support sustainable transport provision, which is therefore likely to have adverse effects in terms of securing accessibility. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | -- | The policy option is likely to be discriminatory against those without access to a car. | + | The policy option is likely to be discriminatory against those without access to a car. | -- | The policy option is likely to be discriminatory against those without access to a car. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | --- | In favouring the car, the policy option promotes unsustainable and inactive modes of transport – increased emissions and reduced physical activity are likely to have adverse health effects. | -- | In favouring the car, the policy option promotes unsustainable and inactive modes of transport – increased emissions and reduced physical activity are likely to have adverse health effects. | --- | In favouring the car, the policy option promotes unsustainable and inactive modes of transport – increased emissions and reduced physical activity are likely to have adverse health effects. | +/- | Although this option is likely to reduce car reliance and encourage modal shift through necessity, it also fails to provide a mechanism to pro-actively support sustainable transport provision, which is therefore unlikely to support the objective. |
| Environmental | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Introduce maximum residential standard but assume high demand/car ownership across borough in setting levels | | Option 2 – Introduce maximum residential standard but assume lower demand/car ownership in areas of highest accessibility and smaller unit sizes (as per H14) | | Option 3: Existing policy approach | | Option 4 - Do Nothing | |
|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | | | | | | | |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | - | Policy unlikely to achieve a modal shift to sustainable modes of transport and would maintain current levels of car ownership. | + | Lower parking provision in areas of highest accessibility is likely to encourage a modal shift towards sustainable modes of transport in urban areas (notably town centres). Car use likely to be maintained in rural areas. | - | Maintaining current policy unlikely to achieve a modal shift to sustainable modes of transport and would maintain current levels of car ownership. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects. With no policy the market could demand additional car parking, with an associated increase in car use, although there is potential for low levels of parking to be provided to maximise land development values, this would encourage a modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effect. | - | Lower parking provision in areas of highest accessibility may have negative effects as residents convert their front gardens into hardstanding which is likely to have negative effects on local biodiversity particularly birds. | 0 | No obvious effect. | -- | To do nothing may result in the conversion of grassed front gardens into hardstanding areas which have negative effects on local biodiversity, particularly birds who are attracting to front garden hedges. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Introduce maximum residential standard but assume high demand/car ownership across borough in setting levels | | Option 2 – Introduce maximum residential standard but assume lower demand/car ownership in areas of highest accessibility and smaller unit sizes (as per H14) | | Option 3: Existing policy approach | | Option 4 - Do Nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Air quality is unlikely to improve with this option. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Air quality may improve in urban areas due to increased public transport usage. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Air quality is unlikely to improve with this option. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Potential for negative and positive effects on air quality dependent on how the market reacts to lack of policy guidance. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | - | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Greenhouse gas emissions are unlikely to be reduced with this option. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Greenhouse gas emissions may be reduced due to increased uptake of sustainable modes of transport. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Greenhouse gas emissions are unlikely to be reduced with this option. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Potential for negative and positive effects on air quality dependent on how the market reacts to lack of policy guidance. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| Economic | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D19: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Transport - Rights of Way / Greenways / Watling Chase

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | +/- | The active management of urban fringe and woodland may help to reduce crime; however, there is a risk that increased woodland cover may heighten fear of crime in some locations. | +/- | Increased provision of countryside may encourage increased activity in such areas, which could contribute to reduced fear of crime arising from natural surveillance. However, there is also a risk that extended countryside catalyses a greater fear of crime. | ++ | Increased accessibility into and through areas of countryside may encourage increased activity in such areas, which could contribute to reduced fear of crime arising from natural surveillance. | - | A restrictive policy concerning use of the countryside is likely to reduce activity in such areas and potentially increase fear of crime. | +/- | It is difficult to predict the impact of having no policy intervention – effects may therefore be positive or negative, depending on the nature of implementation. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | Active management of and increased access to the countryside is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits. | +++ | Active management, increased access and a greater amount of countryside are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through significantly increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits across a broader area of the Borough. | ++ | Increased access to the countryside and linkages to urban areas are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits. | -- | A restrictive approach that limits recreational access into and use of the countryside is likely to constrain opportunities for active leisure pursuits, with potentially detrimental effects for health. | --- | Without policy intervention to protect countryside for development, widespread loss of land to development is likely. This will significantly reduce opportunities for active leisure pursuits, which is likely to be detrimental for health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Increased facilities may increase visitor numbers which may increase erosion of the soil. | - | Increased access may increase visitor numbers which may increase erosion of the soil. However, this effect is likely to be very minor. | + | Restriction may help to conserve soil. | - | Removing protection of rights of way may allow for development to take place which could cause contamination and affect soils. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | + | Current policy should have beneficial effects on landscape character. | +/- | Sites and landscapes should be protected and enhanced directly. However better facilities may increase visitor numbers and increased wear and tear. | - | Increasing access to the countryside through improving links may be detrimental to local landscape through litter. | + | Sites and landscapes likely to be protected and enhanced. | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Current policy should have beneficial effects. | +/- | Sites and landscapes should be protected and enhanced directly. However better facilities may increase visitor number and increase wear and tear. | - | Increasing access to the countryside through improving links may be detrimental to local landscape through litter. | + | Sites and landscapes should be protected and enhanced. | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Protection of rights of way allow the community to walk to facilities and services rather than relying on private car use | +/- | Increasing provision may cause more people to walk to services and facilities. However more people may travel, by car to gateway sites | ++ | Increasing access to greenways and improving links from urban areas will have a significant positive effect on encouraging sustainable modes of transport. | - | Restriction use may cause more travel in private cars to services and facilities | - | Removing protection of rights of way may cause development to occur, reducing their accessibility and causing more travel by private car for services and facilities |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Current policy should have beneficial effects and may enhance through the provision of woodland cover | +/- | Wildlife and habitats should be protected and enhanced directly. However better facilities may increase visitor numbers causing disturbance | - | Increasing access to the countryside through improving links may be detrimental on local biodiversity through increase noise and disturbance. | + | Wildlife and habitats should be protected and enhanced | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development which could cause disturbance and damage |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Removal of protection of rights of way may cause development to occur which may increase flood risk. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Increasing provision may improve air quality if rights of way are used instead of private cars to reach services and facilities. However facilities at gateway sites may increase traffic, decreasing air quality. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on improving air quality. | - | A restrictive approach may cause increases in private car use to reach services and facilities. | - | Removal of protection for rights of way may cause development to occur which could impact on air quality. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Increasing provision may decrease greenhouse gas emissions if rights of way are used instead of private cars to reach services and facilities. However facilities at gateway | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | - | A restrictive approach may cause increases in private car use to reach services and facilities. | - | Removal of protection for rights of way may cause development to occur which could increase greenhouse gas emissions. |

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | sites may increase traffic, increasing greenhouse gas emissions. | | | | | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | + | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for businesses, thus active management of countryside and increased woodland cover may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. | ++ | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for businesses, thus active management of countryside and increased woodland cover may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. Since this option includes extension of the countryside, it is considered to perform better than Option 1. | + | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for business, thus conservation of the countryside as an accessible leisure and recreational resource may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. | + | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for businesses, thus protection of the countryside from development may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. | +/- - | Without policy intervention, it is likely that countryside will be lost to higher value development. This is likely to have detrimental effects on the quality of the environment, which is important in attracting investment; however, the release of additional development sites may better support the economy. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D20: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Transport - Rights of Way / Greenways / Watling Chase

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | +/- | The active management of urban fringe and woodland may help to reduce crime; however, there is a risk that increased woodland cover may heighten fear of crime in some locations. | +/- | Increased provision of countryside may encourage increased activity in such areas, which could contribute to reduced fear of crime arising from natural surveillance. However, there is also a risk that extended countryside catalyses a greater fear of | ++ | Increased accessibility into and through areas of countryside may encourage increased activity in such areas, which could contribute to reduced fear of crime arising from natural surveillance. | - | A restrictive policy concerning use of the countryside is likely to reduce activity in such areas and potentially increase fear of crime. | +/- | It is difficult to predict the impact of having no policy intervention – effects may therefore be positive or negative, depending on the nature of implementation. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | Option 4 - Do nothing | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|-----------------------|---|----|---|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | crime. | | | | | | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | Active management of and increased access to the countryside is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits. | +++ | Active management, increased access and a greater amount of countryside are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through significantly increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits across a broader area of the Borough. | ++ | Increased access to the countryside and linkages to urban areas are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits. | -- | A restrictive approach that limits recreational access into and use of the countryside is likely to constrain opportunities for active leisure pursuits, with potentially detrimental effects for health. | --- | Without policy intervention to protect countryside for development, widespread loss of land to development is likely. This will significantly reduce opportunities for active leisure pursuits, which is likely to be detrimental for health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Increased facilities may increase visitor numbers which may increase erosion of the soil. | - | Increased access may increase visitor numbers which may increase erosion of the soil. However, this effect is likely to be very minor. | + | Restriction may help to conserve soil. | - | Removing protection of rights of way may allow for development to take place which could cause contamination and affect soils. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | + | Current policy should have beneficial effects on landscape character. | +/- | Sites and landscapes should be protected and enhanced directly. However better facilities may increase visitor numbers and increased wear and tear. | - | Increasing access to the countryside through improving links may be detrimental to local landscape through litter. | + | Sites and landscapes likely to be protected and enhanced. | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Current policy should have beneficial effects. | +/- | Sites and landscapes should be protected and enhanced directly. However better facilities may increase visitor number and increase wear and | - | Increasing access to the countryside through improving links may be detrimental to local landscape through litter. | + | Sites and landscapes should be protected and enhanced. | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | tear. | | | | | | |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Protection of rights of way allow the community to walk to facilities and services rather than relying on private car use | +/- | Increasing provision may cause more people to walk to services and facilities. However more people may travel, by car to gateway sites | ++ | Increasing access to greenways and improving links from urban areas will have a significant positive effect on encouraging sustainable modes of transport. | - | Restriction use may cause more travel in private cars to services and facilities | - | Removing protection of rights of way may cause development to occur, reducing their accessibility and causing more travel by private car for services and facilities |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Current policy should have beneficial effects and may enhance through the provision of woodland cover | +/- | Wildlife and habitats should be protected and enhanced directly. However better facilities may increase visitor numbers causing disturbance | - | Increasing access to the countryside through improving links may be detrimental on local biodiversity through increase noise and disturbance. | + | Wildlife and habitats should be protected and enhanced | - | Lack of protection would allow areas to be considered for development which could cause disturbance and damage |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Removal of protection of rights of way may cause development to occur which may increase flood risk. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Increasing provision may improve air quality if rights of way are used instead of private cars to reach services and facilities. However facilities at gateway sites may increase traffic, decreasing air quality. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on improving air quality. | - | A restrictive approach may cause increases in private car use to reach services and facilities. | - | Removal of protection for rights of way may cause development to occur which could impact on air quality. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Increasing provision may decrease greenhouse gas emissions if rights of way are used instead of private cars to reach services and facilities. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on reducing | - | A restrictive approach may cause increases in private car use to reach services and facilities. | - | Removal of protection for rights of way may cause development to occur which could increase greenhouse gas emissions. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Increased provision, including facilities at gateway sites to encourage increased use of the countryside and developer contributions to support this | | Option 3 – increasing access to greenways and rights of way network by creating and improving links from within existing urban areas | | Option 3 - A more restrictive approach, limiting recreational access to and use of the countryside | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | However facilities at gateway sites may increase traffic, increasing greenhouse gas emissions. | | greenhouse gas emissions. | | | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | + | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for businesses, thus active management of countryside and increased woodland cover may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. | ++ | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for businesses, thus active management of countryside and increased woodland cover may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. Since this option includes extension of the countryside, it is considered to perform better than Option 1. | + | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for business, thus conservation of the countryside as an accessible leisure and recreational resource may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. | + | An attractive environment can be a key attractor for businesses, thus protection of the countryside from development may serve to increase the appeal of the Borough to potential businesses, helping to support the economy. | +/- - | Without policy intervention, it is likely that countryside will be lost to higher value development. This is likely to have detrimental effects on the quality of the environment, which is important in attracting investment; however, the release of additional development sites may better support the economy. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D21: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Transport

- Sustainable Transport

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|------|---|----------|---|-----|--|
| | | Option 1 – Actively promote alternatives to the private car, including through support for local area plans, securing developer contributions, the introduction of cycle parking standards, maximum levels of parking provision and lower provision in the most accessible areas. | | Option 2 – As option 1 but presuming high levels of car ownership across the Borough | | Option 3 - Existing policy approach (minimum parking standards for residential development, ad-hoc securing of developer contributions and cycle provision, support for area plans) | | Option 4 - Do Nothing |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | The policy option supports the promotion of sustainable modes of transport through a variety of different means, which should help to improve accessibility for all, including those without access to a car. | ++/- | As Option 1. However, catering for high levels of car ownership may be counter-productive in ensuring accessibility by non-car modes, with potentially detrimental effects in terms of securing public transport accessibility to services and facilities. | +/- - | Although the policy option supports the principle of delivering accessibility by a range of modes, the application of minimum car parking standards is likely to undermine accessibility by non-car modes, with likely detrimental effects against the objective. | --- | Reliance upon the market, although likely to result in lower levels of car parking provision, is unlikely to be matched by requisite improvements in accessibility by non-car modes, which is likely to have overall negative effects against the objective. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | ++ | In promoting accessibility to facilities and services by non-car modes, the policy option should indirectly support the objective in terms of increasing the ability of residents to engage in society and access employment, education and training. | ++/- | As Option 1. However, catering for high levels of car ownership may be counter-productive in ensuring accessibility by non-car modes, with potentially detrimental effects in terms of securing public transport accessibility to employment, education and training. | -- | The policy approach sets out minimum parking standards and does not secure the consistent negotiation of developer contributions or sustainable transport provision. As such, it is unlikely to support accessibility to enable residents to engage in society/ community activities. | --- | Without policy intervention, the policy option is unlikely to support delivery of the requisite accessibility to enable residents to become engaged in society through participation in organised activities, employment, education and training. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Actively promote alternatives to the private car, including through support for local area plans, securing developer contributions, the introduction of cycle parking standards, maximum levels of parking provision and lower provision in the most accessible areas. | Option 2 – As option 1 but presuming high levels of car ownership across the Borough | Option 3 - Existing policy approach (minimum parking standards for residential development, ad-hoc securing of developer contributions and cycle provision, support for area plans) | Option 4 - Do Nothing | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|----------|---|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | | | | | | | | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | +++ | In seeking to actively promote non-car and more active transport modes in preference to provision for the private car, the policy option offers a number of health benefits in terms of reduced emissions and increased physical activity. | --- | In favouring the car, the policy option promotes unsustainable and inactive modes of transport – increased emissions and reduced physical activity are likely to have adverse health effects. | +/- - | In securing provision for cycle parking, the policy option is likely to contribute to an increase in cycling, which can have considerable health benefits. However, this may be offset by the effect of minimum parking standards on encouraging travel by private car. | +/- | Although this option is likely to reduce car reliance and encourage modal shift through necessity, it also fails to provide a mechanism to pro-actively support sustainable transport provision, which is therefore unlikely to support the objective. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | No policy intervention may result in parking which could affect the local landscape and setting of historic assets. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | No policy intervention may result in parking which could affect the local landscape. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Actively promote alternatives to the private car, including through support for local area plans, securing developer contributions, the introduction of cycle parking standards, maximum levels of parking provision and lower provision in the most accessible areas. | | Option 2 – As option 1 but presuming high levels of car ownership across the Borough | | Option 3 - Existing policy approach (minimum parking standards for residential development, ad-hoc securing of developer contributions and cycle provision, support for area plans) | | Option 4 - Do Nothing | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--------------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | ++ | Policy option likely to have a significant positive effect by introducing a range of policy measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects. Although improvements could be achieved by the range of policy measures included in Option 1, these could be undermined by schemes catering for car ownership presumed through this policy. | + | Whilst the existing policy does promote the use of sustainable modes of transport where possible, the policy does not provide certainty in encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. Scale of effect likely to be less than option 1. | +/- | Policy option could lead to increased use of sustainable modes of transport through the lack of parking provision on-site. However, the policy could potentially lead to congestion through increased on-street parking and specific measures, such as cycle parking in new development, will not be provided for. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Measures included in option 1 likely to have a positive effect on local air quality, however these improvements could be offset by the increased car use. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality. Scale of effect less than option 1. | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality. This could be offset by increased congestion and associated air emissions. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Reductions in greenhouse gas emissions through increased use of | + | See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on | +/- | See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Reductions in greenhouse gas emissions could be offset by increased congestion and emissions. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Actively promote alternatives to the private car, including through support for local area plans, securing developer contributions, the introduction of cycle parking standards, maximum levels of parking provision and lower provision in the most accessible areas. | Option 2 – As option 1 but presuming high levels of car ownership across the Borough | Option 3 - Existing policy approach (minimum parking standards for residential development, ad-hoc securing of developer contributions and cycle provision, support for area plans) | Option 4 - Do Nothing | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|----|------------------------------------|----|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | | sustainable modes of transport could be offset by increased vehicle use. | | reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | ++ | In seeking to increase accessibility by non-car modes, the policy option offers the opportunity to ensure that town centres become more accessible to a wider cross-section of the population, thus increasing the potential catchment and helping, indirectly, to support town centre activity. | +/- | As Option 1. However, there is a risk that by catering for high levels of car ownership, increased use of cars will threaten the viability of certain public transport routes, with potentially adverse effects against the objective. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D22: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Transport - Travel Plans

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | Option 2 – Introduce specific requirement for Travel Plans for certain types of development | Option 3 - Do nothing | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | + | This policy approach supports provision of travel plans when required. However, the scope does not extend to all types of development that offer opportunities for transport enhancements. | ++ | The policy option would result in the consistent application of travel planning to a broader range of development, securing a more holistic approach to the delivery and use of sustainable transportation. This should help to secure improved accessibility to a range of trip generators – employment and educational provision as well as town centres are likely to be included. | -- | Without specific policy intervention, developers will not be required to improve accessibility and there is a risk that the role of the private car will be consolidated at the expense of other modes. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | Travel planning represents a means of encouraging sustainable transportation patterns. Since this includes walking and cycling, there is the potential for the policy option to deliver health benefits. | +++ | Travel planning represents a means of encouraging sustainable transportation patterns. Since this includes walking and cycling and the scope encompasses a broad range of development, there is the potential for the policy to deliver considerable health benefits. | -- | Without specific policy intervention, developers will not be required to improve accessibility and there is a risk that the role of the private car will be consolidated at the expense of other modes. This may serve to disincentivise travel by other modes such as walking and cycling, potentially to the detriment of health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Introduce specific requirement for Travel Plans for certain types of development | | Option 3 - Do nothing | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and safeguard soil quality and quantity | | | | | | |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Travel plans which reduce private car use and the impacts this has on the environment could be beneficial | + | Travel plans which reduce private car use and the impacts this has on the environment could be beneficial | - | Without the need for travel plans there would be no real incentive to reduce private car use and environmental impacts would remain and possibly increase. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | + | Implementation of travel plans should have a significant beneficial effect on reducing private car use. | +++ | The requirements for travel plans should have a significant beneficial effect on reducing private car use for some areas. | -- | Without the encouragement to implement travel plans there will continue to be a reliance on the private car. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Travel plans should encourage a move away from private car use which contributes to decreasing air quality | ++ | The requirement for travel plans should encourage a move away from private car use which contributes to decreasing air quality | -- | Without travel plans there is no encouragement to move away from private car use which contributes to decreasing air quality |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Travel plans should encourage a move away from private car use which should decrease greenhouse gas emissions | ++ | The requirements for travel plans should encourage a move away from private car use which should decrease greenhouse gas emissions | -- | Without travel plans there is no encouragement to move away from private car use which should will further increase greenhouse gas emissions |
| 18. To minimise the need for | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Maintain current policy approach | | Option 2 – Introduce specific requirement for Travel Plans for certain types of development | | Option 3 - Do nothing | |
|---|---|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D23: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment - Allotments

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing Policy | | Option 2 – do nothing | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | ++ | The policy option supports the retention and appropriate expansion of allotment sites, which can form essential facilities, in locations that are well related to settlements, thus helping to support accessibility. | - | A 'do nothing' approach is likely to perpetuate the current trend of decline in allotment quality. Since allotments can form essential facilities, this is likely to have detrimental effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | + | Maintaining and improving the allotment stock may have some minor benefits in terms of helping to address food poverty and increase opportunities for engagement. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | + | Improved maintenance and management of the allotment stock may have some benefits in terms of reducing the potential for allotments to become a target for crime and/or anti social behaviour. | - | Without policy intervention, there is a risk that the current trend of decline in allotment quality may increase the attractiveness of sites as targets for crime and/or anti social behaviour. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | Allotments can play an important role at the community level in terms of providing opportunities for recreation, exercise and food production, all of which can contribute to improving health. | - | Without policy intervention, there is a risk that the current trend of decline in allotment quality may increase. Potentially this will reduce opportunities for community use of allotment sites for recreation, exercise and food production, which may have negative effects for health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | -- | Protection of allotment sites will prevent development on them, causing conflict with objective. | + | Development could occur on the allotment sites preventing the need to develop elsewhere, i.e. Greenfield sites. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | ++ | Protection of existing allotments allows for safeguarding of soil quality and quantity within current allotment areas. | -- | Allotments may be lost to development without protection leading to potential significant negative effects on soil quality and quantity. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | + | Protection of allotments will in turn protect landscape character and any historic sites or buildings on the allotments | - | Allotments provide a certain landscape character to an area, a do nothing approach may lead to development on the allotments |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside | + | Protection of allotments will contribute to maintaining the | - | Loss of allotments through a don nothing approach would allow |

| | Option 1 – Base on Existing Policy | | Option 2 – do nothing | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and landscape | | landscape | | development to occur on the site altering the quality of the countryside and landscape |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Allotments may be lost to development without protection leading to potentially significant negative effects on traffic and congestion from new development. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Allotments can provide important habitats on a local scale | - | Loss of allotments could affect locally important wildlife and habitats. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Allotments may be lost to development without protection leading to potential significant negative effects on water quality through runoff through a potential increase in construction activities and impermeable surfaces. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Allotments may be lost to development without protection leading to potential negative effects on water consumption through additional new developments. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Allotments may be lost to development without protection leading to potentially significant negative effects on air quality from new development and associated increases in traffic and congestion. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Allotments may be lost to development without protection leading to potentially negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions from new development and associated increases in traffic and congestion. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D24: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Open Space and the Environment

- Environmental Protection

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|---|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|--|
| | | Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
| opportunities | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | The policy option incorporates measures to minimise the environmental effects of development including reductions in emissions and reduced ambient pollution. Following implementation, such measures should help to improve health, particularly in terms of respiratory disorders, although potentially to a lesser degree than Option 2. | ++ | The policy option incorporates measures to minimise the environmental effects of development to exceed national targets in terms of reductions in emissions and reduced ambient pollution. Coupled with the requirement to provide at least 20% of energy from renewable sources, the implementation of the policy option should help considerably improve health, particularly in terms of respiratory disorders. | + | The policy option seeks to adopt a whole life approach to building design, creating 'healthier' buildings through the use of renewable energy sources and sustainable design. However, beneficial health effects may be limited by lack of direct requirement to cut carbon emissions. | + | Environmental protection can have health benefits in terms of reduced emissions and improved water quality. The policy option proposes a multi-policy approach to implementation – this limits the scope of policy influence; however health benefits are likely. | + | Regional guidance includes some environmental protection, which is important in safeguarding health. However, the effects are likely to be least pronounced in this option as it does not relate directly to local circumstances. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|-----|--|-----|--|-----|--|----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and safeguard soil quality and quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | +/- | Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air, soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes. | +/- | Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air, soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes. | +/- | Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air, soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes. | 0 | No change from existing. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | ++ | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on maintaining the quality of the countryside to the extent that the countryside comprises these natural resources. The sustainable management of such resources is likely to enhance the countryside. | 0 | Benefits to local landscape and countryside quality unclear with this option. | + | The protection of air quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on local landscape quality. | 0 | No clear direct policy and as such, the extent of the knock on effects are unknown. | + | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity, particularly rivers and watercourses which rely on good quality resources for a thriving ecosystem. Reference to PPG25, Draft PPS25, PPS9, PPS7. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|----|---|----|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|
| transport modes | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | ++ | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity, particularly rivers and watercourses which rely on good quality resources for a thriving ecosystem. Also avoiding land liable to flood through sustainable management of water resources (in combination with Theme 15) will have direct positive effects on conserving biodiversity as river corridors and floodplains are important wildlife habitats. | 0 | Benefits to local biodiversity are unclear with this option. | + | The protection of air quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity. | 0 | No clear direct policy option for the protecting natural resources. | + | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity, particularly rivers and watercourses which rely on good quality resources for a thriving ecosystem. Reference to PPG25, Draft PPS25, PPS9, PPS7. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Policy likely to result in the improvement of surface and groundwaters. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | ++ | Policy likely to have a significant positive effect on improving water quality. Policy option could be strengthened by referring to BREEAM (and EcoHomes) standards rather than Sustainable Buildings Code as this is still being finalised. Suggest consideration of achievement of 'very good' / 'excellent' BREEAM standards in all new development. | 0 | Policy option does not address water quality. | + | Although current policies may result in improvement to water quality. These are not strong enough and provide a low level of certainty. | - | Policy option unlikely to result in improvements of surface and ground water quality. |
| 14. To minimise water | + | Policy likely to result in reduction in water consumption in new | ++ | Policy likely to have a significant positive effect on | 0 | Policy option does not address water | 0 | Current policies do not directly address water | - | Policy option unlikely to result in reductions in |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|----|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| consumption | | development. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | | reducing water consumption. Policy could be strengthened by referring to BREEAM standards (see above). Environment Agency seeks new development to reduce water consumption by 25% over contemporary levels. | | consumption. | | consumption. | | water consumption. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Policy option likely to result in improvements in local air quality through limiting emissions from built infrastructure. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | ++ | Policy option likely to reduce emissions from buildings from boilers etc. Policy option could be strengthened by referring to BREEAM standards (see above). | 0 | Policy option does not address air emissions. | + | Although current policies may result in improved air emissions. These are not strong enough and provide a low level of certainty. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Policy option likely to result in improvements in greenhouse gas emissions through limiting emissions from built infrastructure. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | ++ | Policy likely to have a significant positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | + | Policy likely to have a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Scale of reduction likely to be less than option 2. | 0 | Policy option does not directly address greenhouse gas emissions. | + | Regional guidance does refer to reducing greenhouse gas emissions although opportunity to improve upon these general policies would be lost. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy | + | In seeking to minimise pollution risks the option favours the use of cleaner fuels and measures such as renewable energy. | ++ | Policy will have a significant positive effect on increasing energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy. | + | Policy will have a slight positive effect on energy efficiency and potentially renewable energy. | 0 | Policy does not directly address energy efficiency. | + | Reliance on national and regional guidance such as PPG25, PPS25, PPS22, PPS23. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|-----|---|-----|--|----|--|----|--|----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
| efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | | | | | | Policy provides no assurance on uptake of renewable energy as energy efficiency improvements may reduce carbon emissions by 10% alone. | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| Economic | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | +++ | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. Reduced energy consumption should help to reduce operational costs, with economic benefits and in seeking to safeguard environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective. | +++ | As Option 1. In exceeding national targets in respect of emissions, the policy option may help to create a unique selling point, which may be further beneficial to the local economy. | ++ | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. The whole life approach to building design should help to reduce operational costs, with economic benefits and measures to safeguard environmental quality should help to support the objective. | + | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. In safeguarding environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective. | + | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. In safeguarding environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective. However, the regional guidance does not offer the opportunity to adapt to local circumstances. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA/SEA Objective | Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| vitality of town centres | | | | | | | | | | |

Table D25: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Open Space and the Environment

- Environmental Protection

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
| equality of opportunities | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | The policy option incorporates measures to minimise the environmental effects of development including reductions in emissions and reduced ambient pollution. Following implementation, such measures should help to improve health, particularly in terms of respiratory disorders, although potentially to a lesser degree than Option 2. | ++ | The policy option incorporates measures to minimise the environmental effects of development to exceed national targets in terms of reductions in emissions and reduced ambient pollution. Coupled with the requirement to provide at least 20% of energy from renewable sources, the implementation of the policy option should help considerably improve health, particularly in terms of respiratory disorders. | + | The policy option seeks to adopt a whole life approach to building design, creating 'healthier' buildings through the use of renewable energy sources and sustainable design. However, beneficial health effects may be limited by lack of direct requirement to cut carbon emissions. | + | Environmental protection can have health benefits in terms of reduced emissions and improved water quality. The policy option proposes a multi-policy approach to implementation – this limits the scope of policy influence; however health benefits are likely. | + | Regional guidance includes some environmental protection, which is important in safeguarding health. However, the effects are likely to be least pronounced in this option as it does not relate directly to local circumstances. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|-----|--|-----|--|-----|--|----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | +/- | Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air, soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes. | +/- | Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air, soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes. | +/- | Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air, soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes. | 0 | No change from existing. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | ++ | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on maintaining the quality of the countryside to the extent that the countryside comprises these natural resources. The sustainable management of such resources is likely to enhance the countryside. | 0 | Benefits to local landscape and countryside quality unclear with this option. | + | The protection of air quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on local landscape quality. | 0 | No clear direct policy and as such, the extent of the knock on effects are unknown. | + | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity, particularly rivers and watercourses which rely on good quality resources for a thriving ecosystem. Reference to PPG25, Draft PPS25, PPS9, PPS7. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|----|---|----|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| sustainable transport modes | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | ++ | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity, particularly rivers and watercourses which rely on good quality resources for a thriving ecosystem. Also avoiding land liable to flood through sustainable management of water resources (in combination with Theme 15) will have direct positive effects on conserving biodiversity as river corridors and floodplains are important wildlife habitats. | 0 | Benefits to local biodiversity are unclear with this option. | + | The protection of air quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity. | 0 | No clear direct policy option for the protecting natural resources. | + | The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on biodiversity, particularly rivers and watercourses which rely on good quality resources for a thriving ecosystem. Reference to PPG25, Draft PPS25, PPS9, PPS7. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Policy likely to result in the improvement of surface and groundwaters. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | ++ | Policy likely to have a significant positive effect on improving water quality. Policy option could be strengthened by referring to BREEAM (and EcoHomes) standards rather than Sustainable Buildings Code as this is still being finalised. Suggest consideration of achievement of 'very good' / 'excellent' BREEAM standards in all new development. | 0 | Policy option does not address water quality. | + | Although current policies may result in improvement to water quality. These are not strong enough and provide a low level of certainty. | - | Policy option unlikely to result in improvements of surface and ground water quality. |
| 14. To minimise | + | Policy likely to result in reduction | ++ | Policy likely to have a | 0 | Policy option does not | 0 | Current policies do not | - | Policy option unlikely to |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|----|--|----|--|----|---|----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| water consumption | | in water consumption in new development. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | | significant positive effect on reducing water consumption. Policy could be strengthened by referring to BREEAM standards (see above). Environment Agency seeks new development to reduce water consumption by 25% over contemporary levels. | | address water consumption. | | directly address water consumption. | | result in reductions in water consumption. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | Policy option does not refer to flooding. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Policy option likely to result in improvements in local air quality through limiting emissions from built infrastructure. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | ++ | Policy option likely to reduce emissions from buildings from boilers etc. Policy option could be strengthened by referring to BREEAM standards (see above). | 0 | Policy option does not address air emissions. | + | Although current policies may result in improved air emissions. These are not strong enough and provide a low level of certainty. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Policy option likely to result in improvements in greenhouse gas emissions through limiting emissions from built infrastructure. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets. | ++ | Policy likely to have a significant positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | + | Policy likely to have a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Scale of reduction likely to be less than option 2. | 0 | Policy option does not directly address greenhouse gas emissions. | + | Regional guidance does refer to reducing greenhouse gas emissions although opportunity to improve upon these general policies would be lost. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, | + | In seeking to minimise pollution risks the option favours the use of cleaner fuels and measures | ++ | Policy will have a significant positive effect on increasing energy efficiency and the use | + | Policy will have a slight positive effect on energy efficiency and potentially | 0 | Policy does not directly address energy efficiency. | + | Reliance on national and regional guidance such as PPG25, PPS25, |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | | |
|---|-----|--|-----|--|----|--|----|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | | such as renewable energy. | | of renewable energy. | | renewable energy. Policy provides no assurance on uptake of renewable energy as energy efficiency improvements may reduce carbon emissions by 10% alone. | | | | PPS22, PPS23. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| Economic | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | +++ | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. Reduced energy consumption should help to reduce operational costs, with economic benefits and in seeking to safeguard environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective. | +++ | As Option 1. In exceeding national targets in respect of emissions, the policy option may help to create a unique selling point, which may be further beneficial to the local economy. | ++ | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. The whole life approach to building design should help to reduce operational costs, with economic benefits and measures to safeguard environmental quality should help to support the objective. | + | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. In safeguarding environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective. | + | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. In safeguarding environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective. However, the regional guidance does not offer the opportunity to adapt to local circumstances. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA/SEA Objective | | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|--|----|-----------------------|----|-----------------------|----|-----------------------|----|-----------------------|----|-----------------------|
| viability and vitality of town centres | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Option 1 – Seek developments that minimise their impact on the environment through the prudent use of natural resources; greenhouse gas emissions; water, noise, light and air pollution; water consumption; waste production and the proper management of contaminated land, soil and water quality including the control of waste materials. | Option 2 Have a policy that states all development will be expected to <u>exceed</u> the provisions of national targets and requirements along with the forthcoming Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulation requirements, providing at least 20% of the energy requirements of each building from sustainable / renewable sources. | Option 3 - Have a policy which requires 10% of carbon emissions to be off-set through renewable energy/sustainable design - rather than 10% generated through renewables alone (a whole life approach to building management) | Option 4 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 5 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|--|--|--|--|

Table D26: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment - Playing Fields

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|-----|---|------|--|----|--|-----|--|
| | | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | | Option 2 – Relax policy where it will fund improved school facilities across the rest of the site | | Option 3 - Maintain current policy | | Option 4 - Do nothing |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | -- | The loss of playing fields to alternative development will result in an overall reduction in availability of sites for physical education and sports-related training. | ++/- | This policy option permits the loss of playing fields to enable expansion of school buildings to accommodate additional teaching/training space. This is likely to have mixed effects – beneficial in terms of expansion of the range of school facilities; however, detrimental in terms of space for physical education and sports-related training. | + | This policy option seeks to retain existing playing fields and facilitates limited development where it will support their continued use (i.e. changing room and/or pavilion construction). This should help to support physical education and sports-based training across the District. | +/- | Without policy intervention, it is likely that playing fields will be lost to higher value development. Whilst this may bring some economic benefits to schools/LEAs and enable re-investment in educations; the net loss of playing fields is likely to have detrimental effects on the availability of teaching space for physical education and training. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | +/- | Playing fields are important community resources for sporting and recreational pursuits. The policy is likely to have differing spatial effects – where playing fields are protected, effects are likely to be beneficial; where playing fields are released for alternative development, effects are likely to be detrimental. | - | Playing fields at schools are often available for shared community use. The loss of playing fields under this policy is likely to result in detrimental effects against the objective. | + | This policy option seeks to retain existing playing fields and facilitates limited development where it will support their continued use (i.e. changing room and/or pavilion construction). This approach is therefore likely to improve provision in locations accessible to community members. | -- | Without policy intervention it is likely that playing fields, which are an important community resource in accessible areas, will be lost to higher value development. This will have detrimental effects upon the objective. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | + | The release of some playing fields may increase availability of sites for housing development. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | ++ | Without policy intervention to protect playing fields, it is likely that many will become available for housing development. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | Option 2 – Relax policy where it will fund improved school facilities across the rest of the site | Option 3 - Maintain current policy | Option 4 - Do nothing | | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------------------------|--|----|--|-----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| social behaviour | | | | | | | | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | +/- | Playing fields play a crucial role in terms of providing space for sports, leisure and informal recreation, which are important for health. The protection of some sites will be beneficial; however, the release of some sites for development may be detrimental to health. | - | The release of playing fields for educational development will reduce the availability of sport, leisure and recreation sites for the community, which is likely to result in adverse effects against the objective. | + | This policy option seeks to retain existing playing fields and facilitates limited development where it will support their continued use (i.e. changing room and/or pavilion construction). This approach is therefore likely to improve provision in locations accessible to community members, which should have benefits against the objective. | -- | Without policy intervention, it is likely that many playing field sites will be lost to higher value development. This will reduce the availability of sites for community sport, leisure and recreation, which is likely to have detrimental effects for health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | - | Playing fields are not PDL and therefore any development will not meet the sequential approach in identifying PDL as priority. | + | Use of surplus playing fields for educational development will reduce the need to develop in additional educational facilities in Greenfield locations. | + | No release of urban playing fields will encourage developers to make the most efficient use of PDL where it is available to maximise profits. | -- | Without protection playing fields are likely to be considered for development as urban infill sites. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | +/- | Development on playing fields would reduce any previous contamination through mitigation. However development itself may create contamination and effect soil quality. | +/- | Development on playing fields would reduce any previous contamination through mitigation. However development itself may create contamination and effect soil quality. | 0 | No obvious effect. | +/- | Development on playing fields would reduce any previous contamination through mitigation. However development itself may create contamination and effect soil quality. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | - | Possible negative effects on the urban landscape character through change and loss of open playing fields to housing or | 0 | Minimal change in local landscape as playing fields will be developed for educational facilities. | ++ | Protection of playing fields should protect local landscape quality of the surrounding areas. | -- | Possible negative effects on local landscape due to the conversion of open playing fields to housing or employment land |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | Option 2 – Relax policy where it will fund improved school facilities across the rest of the site | | Option 3 - Maintain current policy | | Option 4 - Do nothing | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | employment land. | | | | | | |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | +/- | Use of land for development may reduce the need to travel by car or at all for housing and employment needs. However it may increase the need to travel for playing fields or general recreation. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No change from existing. | +/- | Use of land for development may reduce the need to travel by car or at all for housing and employment needs. However it may increase the need to travel for playing fields or general recreation |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | - | The extent to which urban playing fields may be wildlife havens, their development is likely to result in negative effects. | - | The extent to which urban playing fields may be wildlife havens, their development is likely to result in negative effects. | 0 | No change from existing. | -- | Potential negative effects as with no policy intervention, urban playing fields and open spaces will be lost to development therefore losing sites of important for urban biodiversity and which may act as wildlife corridors. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | - | Development on playing fields has the potential to alter and pollute hydrological pathways. | - | Development on playing fields has the potential to alter and pollute hydrological pathways. | 0 | No change from existing. | - | Development on playing fields has the potential to alter and pollute hydrological pathways. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | - | Development on playing fields, either housing or employment, is likely to increase water consumption significantly | - | Development on playing fields, either housing or employment, is likely to increase water consumption significantly | 0 | No change from existing. | -- | Development on playing fields, either housing or employment, is likely to increase water consumption significantly |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | - | Development on playing fields, either housing or employment, is likely to significantly increase flood risk due to the change from a permeable to largely impermeable surface. | - | Development on playing fields, is likely to significantly increase flood risk due to the change from a permeable to largely impermeable surface. | + | Playing fields provide a large area of permeable land for rain/flood water to soak through. Their protection may even provide a buffer between a river or flood risk area and housing. | -- | Development on playing fields, either housing or employment, is likely to significantly increase flood risk due to the change from a permeable to largely impermeable surface. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | - | Development on playing fields is likely to increase activity such as transport movement which will affect air quality. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust. | - | Development on playing fields is likely to increase activity such as transport movement which will affect air quality. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Development on playing fields is likely to increase activity such as transport movement which will affect air quality. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | - | Development on playing fields is likely to increase activity such as transport movement which will | - | Development on playing fields is likely to increase activity such as transport movement which will increase | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Development on playing fields is likely to increase activity such as transport movement which will |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | Option 2 – Relax policy where it will fund improved school facilities across the rest of the site | Option 3 - Maintain current policy | Option 4 - Do nothing | | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------------------------|---|----|-----------------------|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | increase greenhouse gas emission. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust. | | greenhouse gas emission. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust | | | | increase greenhouse gas emission. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D27: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment - Protecting Local Character

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | Option 1 – | | Option 2 – | | Option 3 – | | Option 4 – | | Option 5 – | | Option 6 – | |
|---|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|---|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|
| | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | ++ | In including an accessibility and proximity element to housing density criteria, the policy option should help to ensure that higher densities of development occur in the most accessible locations, where services and facilities are best placed to serve increasing population densities. | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|-----|---|-----|--|----|---|-----|---|----------|--|----|---|
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | +/- | In ensuring that development and intensification of residential areas respects local character, the policy should contribute to safeguarding the quality of housing. However, the policy option may prove restrictive in terms of enabling the introduction of new building forms to meet identified housing needs. | +/- | In permitting the intensification of development in residential areas, the policy may help to facilitate the introduction of new housing types, potentially to meet identified needs. However, the targets may prove too restrictive to support the level of development that may be required. | + | In including an element of accessibility and proximity considerations in the determination of residential densities, the policy option offers the opportunity to ensure that specific housing types are accommodated in the most appropriate locations. In permitting increased densities, the option also offers the opportunity to introduce new housing types, potentially to meet identified housing needs. | +/- | In permitting some degree of flatted developments and sub-division, the policy option should help to support the introduction of housing types that are, by their very nature, more affordable. There is, however, a risk that in allowing upwards trends in density, housing and environmental quality may be compromised. | +/- - | In permitting some degree of residential intensification, the policy option should help to support the introduction of housing types that are likely to be more affordable. However, the policies do not fully reflect current national guidance and there is risk that their implementation may be piecemeal in nature. | -- | Reliance on national and regional policies significantly reduces the ability of the council to negotiate provision and ensure that it is tailored to local needs. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|----|-----------------------|----|---|-----|-----------------------|-----|--|----|--|
| equality of opportunities | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No effect – in ensuring intensification respects character, open spaces important for health and recreation should be preserved. | 0 | As Option 1. | - | The policy option is likely to result in increased residential densities across the Borough, with the potential risk of town cramming, which could be detrimental to health in terms of reduced green space and increased concentrations of pollutants. | - | As Option 3. | -- | Reliance on a range of different policies is unlikely to result in the application of policies in a consistent manner. There is a risk that important recreational space may be lost to development pressure, with potentially adverse effects for health. | -- | Reliance upon regional and national policies limits the ability of the council to ensure that policies are negotiated on the basis of local conditions. This may result in the loss of important recreational space to development, with potentially adverse effects for health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the | -- | Potential negative | - | Having a cap of | - | Maintaining existing | -/+ | Maintaining | -/+ | Maintaining | + | Relying on |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|----|---|-----|---|----|---|----|--|----|--|----|---|
| most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | effects as this policy is restrictive to ensuring that development respects local character which may result in resisting intensification of some areas and higher densities. | | intensification beyond a certain point will also not maximise making most efficient use of land if the buildings in the remainder of the street can be developed but resisted because the cap had been reached. | | density may not make the most efficient use of land as some areas have been identified as giving very low or low densities in the urban capacity study. | | existing density may not make the most efficient use of land as some areas have been identified as giving very low or low densities in the urban capacity study. However, efficient use of land could be met in accessible urban areas with medium to high level of density stated in the UCS as between 50-10dph. | | existing density may not make the most efficient use of land as some areas have been identified as giving very low or low densities in the urban capacity study. However, efficient use of land could be met in accessible urban areas with medium to high level of density stated in the UCS as between 50-10dph. | | regional and national guidance will ensure that higher densities (30-50dph) are consistently met thus having positive effects |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape | ++ | This option ensures that redevelopment respects and reflects the overall character | +/- | A cap of intensification is assessed as having a mix of | - | No reference to protecting or having regard to the valued and recognised | - | No reference to protecting or having regard to the valued and | + | Some protection for having regard to the valued and recognised | -- | No reference to protecting or having regard to the valued and |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|----|---|----|---|----|--|----|--|----|--|----|---|
| character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | | and as such, it will be highly complementary with this objective in protecting the character of historic assets and their settings. | | negative effects, negative until the cap is reached, then positive effects as the character will be protected. | | character of the surroundings townscape of historic buildings. | | recognised character of the surroundings townscape of historic buildings. | | character in existing local plan policies. | | recognised character of the surroundings townscape of historic buildings. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | - | Policy does not directly address location of development. Potential for increased use of the private car as policy not based on accessibility to town centres / sustainable modes of transport. | - | Policy does not directly address location of development. Potential for increased use of the private car as policy not based on accessibility to town centres / sustainable modes of transport. | ++ | Residential density range based upon accessibility and proximity to town centres is likely to enable the use of sustainable modes of transport based on good access to these forms of transport. | + | Policy option is likely to result in increased densities in town centres, with higher accessibility to sustainable modes of transport. | - | Current policies do not directly address the location of development in relation to accessibility. Potential for increased use of the private car. | -- | Option unlikely to address location of development and adapt to local issues and constraints. Potential for increased use of the private car. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|--|----|---|----|--|----|---|----|---|----|--|----|--|
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in degraded local air | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greater use of sustainable modes | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Greater use of sustainable | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|---|----|---|----|---|----|---|----|---|----|---|
| | | degraded local air quality. | | degraded local air quality. | | of transport, and consequently less use of the private car is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality. | | modes of transport, and consequently less use of the private car is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality. | | degraded local air quality. | | degraded local air quality. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in increased emissions of greenhouse gases. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in increased emissions of greenhouse gases. | ++ | See assessment of SA objective 11. Less use of the private car, compared to contemporary levels, is likely to result in a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | + | See assessment of SA objective 11. Less use of the private car, compared to contemporary levels, is likely to result in a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | - | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in increased emissions of greenhouse gases. | -- | See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased car use may result in increased emissions of greenhouse gases. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|----|-----------------------|----|--|----|-----------------------|-----|---|------|--|
| renewable energy | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect | 0 | No effect |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | + | In supporting increased densities in principle, the policy option may help to support town centres through increasing population (i.e. catchment) density. | + | As Option 1. | ++ | In setting residential density ranges on the basis of accessibility and proximity to town centres, the policy option offers the opportunity to support town centre vitality and viability through supporting increased population (i.e. catchment) | + | As Option 1. | +/- | In supporting increased densities in principle, the policy option may help to support town centres through increasing population (i.e. catchment) density. However, the use of a range of policies may fail to result in consistent | ++/- | Current national and regional policies include emphasis on increasing residential densities in the most accessible locations, particularly town centres. However, there is a risk that |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| Option 1 – Have a policy that states for developments that involve the intensification / redevelopment of existing residential land, it must respect / reflect the overall character of the surrounding area, in terms of residential density, form and scale. | | | Option 2 – Have a policy that states that within existing residential areas, there will be a maximum of X% of a single block / street developed for intensification, including the sub-division of properties, in order to protect the overall character, scale and form of the existing area. | | Option 3 - Have a policy that requires a residential density range based upon accessibility, proximity to town centres, or based upon the existing residential density range and character of the area. | | Option 4 - Developments that seek the intensification of existing residential areas, including for flat developments and sub-division, should not result in an overall density that exceeds the upper limit of the next highest density range as defined by the typical urban area assessment within the urban capacity study. | | Option 5 - Maintain current policy approach to these issues albeit in separate policies throughout the Local Plan 2003. | | Option 6 - Do nothing and rely upon central and regional government guidance on these issues. | |
|---|----|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | | | within and accessible to town centres across the Borough. | | | | application of the policy principles, which could undermine their effectiveness. | | reliance on high level policies will limit the effectiveness of ensuring that policies are applied in a manner that is appropriate to the local context. |

Table D28: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment - Safeguarded Mineral Land

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Base on existing policy but limit to preferred areas | Option 2 – Base on existing policy but also include sites outside of preferred areas | Option 3 – do nothing | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | In failing to protect mineral reserves from development, there may be a greater availability of sites to meet housing requirements. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | +/- | Safeguarding of mineral and preventing development should help preserve soil quality and quantity; which may otherwise be affected by development. In the long term there is the | +/- | Safeguarding of mineral and preventing development should help preserve soil quality and quantity; which may otherwise be affected by development. In the long term there is the | - | Without protection of minerals, development could occur, disturbing the soil and effecting quality and quantity |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on existing policy but limit to preferred areas | Option 2 – Base on existing policy but also include sites outside of preferred areas | Option 3 – do nothing | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------|---|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | potential for loss of valuable soil resources to mineral development. | | potential for loss of valuable soil resources to mineral development. | | |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | +/- | Safeguarding land would protect the character or buildings on it until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | +/- | Safeguarding land would protect the character or buildings on it until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | - | Lack of protection would allow development to occur which may affect landscape character and sites. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | +/- | Safeguarding land would protect the countryside and landscape until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | +/- | Safeguarding land would protect the countryside and landscape until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | - | Lack of protection would allow development to occur which could be detrimental for the countryside and landscape. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | +/- | Safeguarding land would protect the wildlife and habitats on it until the time of its use for mineral extraction | +/- - | Safeguarding land would protect the wildlife and habitats on it until the time of its use for mineral extraction. Habitats outside of preferred areas may be negatively affected. | -- | Lack of protection would allow development to occur which could be detrimental to wildlife and habitats. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | +/- | Preventing development on the site will prevent disturbance to the hydrological movement and possible pollution until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | +/- - | Preventing development on the site will prevent disturbance to the hydrological movement and possible pollution until the time of its use for mineral extraction. Waters outside of preferred areas may be negatively affected. | - | Allowing development on sites may disturb the hydrological movement, with possible impacts on water quality. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | + | Preventing development, which would require water, would minimise water consumption for the area. | + | Preventing development, which would require water, would minimise water consumption for the area. | - | Allowing development would increase water consumption for the area. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | +/- | Preventing development would allow the surface permeability to remain the same until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | +/- - | Preventing development would allow the surface permeability to remain the same until the time of its use for mineral extraction. Flood zones outside of preferred areas may be negatively affected. | - | Allowing development would alter the permeability of the area and increase flood risk. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | +/- | Preventing development would ensure activity in the area was low which should be beneficial until the time of its use for mineral extraction. | +/- - | Preventing development would ensure activity in the area was low which should be beneficial. Negative air quality effect may not be manageable outside of preferred areas. | - | Allowing development would increase activity and impact on air quality |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on existing policy but limit to preferred areas | | Option 2 – Base on existing policy but also include sites outside of preferred areas | | Option 3 – do nothing | |
|--|---|--|--|---|-----------------------|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| emissions | | | | | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | ++ | Safeguarding mineral reserves from sterilisation will help to secure the role of this sector of employment within the economy. | ++ | Safeguarding and extending the protection of mineral reserves should help to secure the role of this sector of employment within the economy, helping to achieve a greater balance. | ++/- | In failing to protect mineral reserves from sterilisation, this sector of the economy may suffer; however, there would potentially be a greater range of sites available for alternative economic development across the District. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D29: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment - Trees and Hedgerows

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
|---|----|--|----|--|----|---|
| | | Option 1 – Base on existing policies, notably E4, E8 and E9 of the Local Plan, which seek to protect (TPO'd) trees and features of importance for nature conservation, and Policy C7 which promotes the Watling Chase Community Forest | | Option 2 – Explicitly seek additional tree cover within the Watling Chase Community Forest through proactive provision and / or developer contributions | | Option 3 – do nothing |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Provision of additional tree cover may have health benefits in terms of its contribution to improved air quality and additional space for recreation and leisure activities. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | + | Protecting of existing trees and hedgerows will maintain soil quality and quantity. | ++ | Tree planting will reduce erosion within the Community Forest and offer a higher level of protection of the quantity of soil. | -- | The protection of trees and hedgerows on soil resources will be lost. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, | + | Protection of trees, hedges and forests will contribute positively to landscape character | ++ | Protection and enhancement of trees, hedges and forests will contribute | -- | Risk that trees, hedges and forests will be cleared for development, altering |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Base on existing policies, notably E4, E8 and E9 of the Local Plan, which seek to protect (TPO'd) trees and features of importance for nature conservation, and Policy C7 which promotes the Watling Chase Community Forest | | | Option 2 – Explicitly seek additional tree cover within the Watling Chase Community Forest through proactive provision and / or developer contributions | | | Option 3 – do nothing |
|--|----|--|-----|---|---|--|----|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | | | | positively to landscape character | | landscape character | | |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Protection of trees, hedges and forests will contribute positively to landscape character | ++ | Protection and enhancement of trees, hedges and forests will contribute positively to landscape character | -- | Risk that trees, hedges and forests will be cleared for development, altering landscape character | | |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | + | Protection of trees, hedges and forests will contribute positively to wildlife and habitat protection | ++ | Protection and enhancement of trees, hedges and forests will contribute positively to wildlife and habitat protection and enhancement | -- | Risk that trees, hedges and forests will be cleared for development, impacting on wildlife and habitats | | |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Likely to maintain water quality within protected areas. | ++ | Likely to maintain water quality within protected areas. Water quality may increase within the Community Forest with increased planting and less erosion. | -- | Likely to have a major effect on degrading water quality within currently protected areas which may be developed. | | |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | | |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | + | Protection of existing trees and hedgerows will maintain areas of trees that may act as buffer to flooding and surface runoff. | ++ | Additional tree planting may add additional buffering of flood events within the Community Forest area. | -- | Likely to have a major effect as currently protected sites may be lost to development which may increase flood risk through surface runoff. | | |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Protection of existing trees and hedgerows will maintain areas of trees that act as buffer to differing areas of air quality. | ++ | Additional tree planting within the Community Forest will improve air quality through providing additional air filtering capacity. | - | Loss of trees and hedgerows will have negative effects on air quality through the loss of the buffering and filtering capacity that trees and hedgerows currently provide. | | |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Protection of existing trees and hedgerows will maintain existing carbon sink. | +++ | Additional tree planting will have a major effect on increasing carbon sink capacity for the District. | -- | Loss of trees and hedgerows will have a negative effect through the loss of carbon sink capacity. | | |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Without protection, development could occur increasing the need for energy in some form | | |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Without protection, development could | | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Base on existing policies, notably E4, E8 and E9 of the Local Plan, which seek to protect (TPO'd) trees and features of importance for nature conservation, and Policy C7 which promotes the Watling Chase Community Forest | Option 2 – Explicitly seek additional tree cover within the Watling Chase Community Forest through proactive provision and / or developer contributions | Option 3 – do nothing | | |
|---|----|--|---|-----------------------|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | | | | | | occur which would increase waste generation |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

Table D30: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment- Urban Open Land

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | Option 2 – Maintain current policy (p108) with redrawn lines | Option 3 - Maintain the current policy as existing | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|----|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | - | Urban open land can serve a role as an essential recreational facility and pedestrian/cycle routes to other services and facilities – the loss of sites may therefore result in negative effects. | ++ | Reviewing provision and protecting the best sites from development offers the opportunity to improve the quality of provision and ensure that protected sites assist in better connecting urban areas. On the other hand, releasing urban open spaces for development may also present opportunities to enhance access. | + | Protecting urban open land sites from development offers the opportunity to safeguard their recreational and connectivity function, which should be beneficial. |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | + | Relaxing policy may allow the future development of urban land sites and as such, this option could contribute to meeting identified housing needs. | +/- | Relaxing policy may allow the future development of urban land sites and as such, this option could contribute to meeting identified housing needs. However, on the other hand, restricting the release of urban open land sites may have negative effects and preclude Hertsmere meeting their housing targets. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | + | Urban open land can often become the location for a range of anti-social behaviours – rationalisation of provision may help to reduce both fear and incidence of crime in some locations. | + | Urban open land can often become the location for a range of anti-social behaviours – review of provision offers the opportunity to include a ‘safety’ dimension in the assessment criteria and re-draw boundaries to create space that is better open to natural surveillance, thus helping to support the objective. | - | In protecting all existing sites, there is a risk that the policy option may perpetuate any existing issues surrounding anti-social behaviours end/or fear of crime associated with urban open space. |
| 6. To improve population’s health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | - | Urban open land can serve a role as an essential recreational facility and pedestrian/cycle routes to other services and facilities – the loss of sites may therefore result in adverse effects. | +/- | Reviewing provision and protecting the best sites from development offers the opportunity to improve the quality of provision and ensure that protected sites assist in better connecting urban areas. This may assist in encouraging healthier lifestyles. Conversely the loss of sites may result in negative effects. | + | Protecting urban open land sites from development offers the opportunity to safeguard their recreational and connectivity function, which should be beneficial. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most | + | Development on urban open land would reduce the need to use Greenfield sites | - | Protection of land could cause development to take place in Greenfield sites | - | Protection of land could cause development to take place in |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | | Option 2 – Maintain current policy (p108) with redrawn lines | | Option 3 - Maintain the current policy as existing | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | | | | | Greenfield sites |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | - | Relaxation of policy and development on open land could have a negative impact | +/- | Protection of open land would be beneficial in preventing damage to surrounding sites from development. However, releasing some urban open space for development is likely to have negative effects. | + | Protection of open land would be beneficial in preventing damage to surrounding sites from development |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | - | Additional development may increase levels of congestion and vehicle use. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | - | Relaxation of policy and development on open land could have a negative effect. | +/- | Protection of open land would be beneficial in preventing damage to habitats and wildlife. However, releasing some urban open space for development is likely to have negative effects. | + | Protection of open land would be beneficial in preventing damage to habitats and wildlife. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | - | Loss of areas of urban open land to development may lead to negative effects on water quality through contaminated surface runoff. | +/- | Assuming an increase in area of urban open land protected from development, positive effects are likely through reduced levels contaminated runoff compared to developed land. However, releasing some urban open space for development is likely to have negative effects. | + | Protection of existing areas of urban open land will have a positive effect on maintaining current levels of air quality. |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | - | Loss of areas of urban open land to development will lead to additional demand for potable water. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | -- | Loss of areas of urban open land has the potential for major negative effects on increasing flood risk through the increase in impermeable surfaces. | +/- | Assuming an increase in the area of urban open land, surface runoff may be decrease with subsequent positive effects on minimising flood risk. However, releasing some urban open space for development is likely to have negative | + | Current areas of urban open land act as a buffer to flood risk. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Relax policy to allow future development where there is a known surplus/deficiency (in terms of Government methodology) | | Option 2 – Maintain current policy (p108) with redrawn lines | | Option 3 - Maintain the current policy as existing | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | effects. | | |
| 16. To improve local air quality | -- | Loss of areas of urban open land has the potential for major negative effects on air quality from additional emissions for vehicle use from new development. | +/- | Assuming an increase in the area of open land, the buffering capacity of open areas of land may lead to local improvements in air quality. However, releasing some urban open space for development is likely to have negative effects. | + | Current areas of urban open land act as a buffer to differing areas of air quality. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | -- | Loss of areas of urban open space will lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions from new development. | +/- | Assuming an increase in the area of open land, the carbon sink capacity of urban open land (and associated biomass) will decrease emissions of greenhouse gases. However, releasing some urban open space for development is likely to have negative effects. | + | Current areas of urban open land act as a carbon sink. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | 0 | No obvious effects. | +/- | Protecting urban open space may restrict potential development opportunities and preclude Hertsmere meeting housing targets or employment land requirements resulting in negative effects. However, on the other hand, releasing some areas of urban land may create opportunities for development to benefits the economy. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | +/- | Urban open land can serve an important function in town centres, helping to create a more attractive environment and a 'break' from hard landscaping – the loss of certain sites to development may therefore have adverse effects. However, the release of sites for built development in prime central locations may also present opportunities to develop new attractions to support the objective. | +/- | Urban open land can serve an important function in town centres, helping to create a more attractive environment and a 'break' from hard landscaping – a careful review of sites and release of certain land for redevelopment should help to safeguard valuable green space yet also release less attractive sites for more beneficial development, which should make a significant contribution to the objective. However, the release of sites for built development in prime central locations may also present opportunities to develop new attractions to support the objective. | ++ | Urban open land can serve an important function in town centres, helping to create a more attractive environment and a 'break' from hard landscaping. |

Table D31: Assessment of the range of options for achieving Core Strategy Policy Theme: Protecting the Urban and Rural Environment - Wildlife Sites and Protected Species

Scale of Effect (SE): 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| | | Option 1 – Base on existing Policy | | Option 2 – Extension of existing sites to include buffer zone | | Option 3 – Proactive provision of new habitats | | Option 4 –Do nothing | |
|---|----|---|----|---|-----|---|-----|---|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | |
| 2. To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | |
| 3. To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | 0 | No effect | - | Potential for negative effect as sufficient land may not be available to meet development need. | 0 | No effect | + | The market-led approach may have indirect benefits in terms of contributing to the provision of additional sites for potential housing development. | |
| 4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | |
| 5. To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | |
| 6. To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | ++ | Wildlife sites and the natural habitats are important in helping to combat air pollution and providing space for informal recreation – their protection should therefore contribute to the health aspects of the objective. | ++ | Wildlife sites and the natural habitats are important in helping to combat air pollution and providing space for informal recreation – their protection should therefore contribute to the health aspects of the objective. | +++ | Wildlife sites and the natural habitats are important in helping to combat air pollution and providing space for informal recreation – their protection and extension should therefore contribute to the health aspects of the objective. | --- | Without policy intervention, development pressure is likely to lead to the loss of wildlife sites. Since these have recreational value and contribute to combating air pollution, their loss is likely to be detrimental to health. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Option may encourage further development in town centre | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on existing Policy | Option 2 – Extension of existing sites to include buffer zone | Option 3 – Proactive provision of new habitats | Option 4 –Do nothing | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|----|---|-----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | | | locations. Scale of effect dependent on scale of buffer zone and proximity to developed location. | | | | |
| 8. To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | ++ | Existing policy will safeguard soil quality and quantity in protected areas. | +++ | Extension of existing sites will increase the area of land protected from development. | ++ | New habitats, either integrated into new development, or new sites, is likely to have a positive effect on protecting soil quality, although not to the same extent as policy option 2. | -- | Policy may lead to loss of protected areas with associated negative effects on soil quality and quantity from development. |
| 9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |
| 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | + | Option likely to maintain the current quality of countryside and landscape. | ++ | Option likely to increase the current quality of countryside and landscape through the greater extent of protected area. | + | New habitats are likely to improve the quality of the countryside and landscape quality, although not to the same extent as option 1. | - | Potential for loss of countryside and landscape quality. |
| 11. To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Potential for loss of existing sites to development which potentially could lead to greater vehicle use. |
| 12. To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | ++ | Existing habitats and wildlife will be protected through existing policies. | +++ | Additional habitats and wildlife will be protected through the extension of the buffer zone. | ++ | The proactive provision of new habitats will enhance existing habitats and provide new habitats, although not to the same extent as option 2. | --- | Existing sites will be lost with significant negative effects on wildlife and habitats. |
| 13. To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | + | Policy will maintain water quality within existing protected areas. | +++ | Policy has the potential to protect water quality in buffer zones through the prevention of development and minimisation of surface run off effects. | ++ | New habitats may provide filtering for local water bodies. | - | Potential for loss of existing sites to development which potentially could lead to detrimental effects on water quality in developed areas. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | Option 1 – Base on existing Policy | Option 2 – Extension of existing sites to include buffer zone | Option 3 – Proactive provision of new habitats | Option 4 –Do nothing | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|---|----|--|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| 14. To minimise water consumption | 0 | No obvious effects. | + | Policy has the potential to minimise water consumption through restricting development from buffer zones. | 0 | No obvious effects. | - | Potential for loss of existing sites to development which potentially could lead to increased water consumption. |
| 15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | + | Policy will minimise flood risk within existing protected areas. | ++ | Policy has the potential to minimise flood risk by reducing surface run off from development. | + | Policy has the potential to minimise flood risk, although the area of land involved is likely to be less than option 2. | - | Potential for loss of existing sites to development which potentially could lead to increased flood risk from surface run off. |
| 16. To improve local air quality | + | Policy will protect air quality within protected areas. | +++ | Air quality will be protected within buffer zones as development will be restricted. | ++ | Air quality will be protected within new habitats, although the area of land involved is likely to be less than option 2. | - | Potential for additional development which could have negative effects on air quality from additional vehicle use. |
| 17. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | + | Carbon sink capacity of protected habitats will be maintained. | +++ | Greenhouse gas emissions will be minimised by restricting new development in the buffer zones. | ++ | Additional habitats will provide carbon sink capacity, although the area of land involved is likely to be less than option 2. | - | Potential for additional development which could have negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions from additional vehicle use and emissions from housing. |
| 18. To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Potential for additional development will have significant negative effects on energy demand. |
| 19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | -- | Potential for additional development will have significant negative effects waste production. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | | |
| 20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | + | Maintaining habitats will contribute indirectly towards quality of life and a stable economy. | +/- | Potential for positive and negative effects. The buffer zone will provide additional protection for habitats, with indirect positive economic effects, however this option may restrict development potential for housing and employment uses. Scale of effect is dependent on the size and | ++ | Maintaining and providing new habitats will contribute indirectly towards quality of life and a stable economy. | - | Loss of habitats may indirectly contribute towards poor quality of life with subsequent economic effects. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | Option 1 – Base on existing Policy | Option 2 – Extension of existing sites to include buffer zone | Option 3 – Proactive provision of new habitats | Option 4 –Do nothing | |
|--|----|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| SA/SEA Objective | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation | SE | Comments/ explanation |
| | | | | scale of the buffer zone and potential development sites affected. | | |
| 21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. | 0 | No obvious effects. |

APPENDIX E

Assessment of Preferred Policy Options

Table E1: Strategic Spatial Policies

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Policy SP1 Improving and sustaining the quality of the local environment</p> | <p>The use and development of all land will be assessed against the need to protect and enhance the natural and built environment, including the diverse character and local distinctiveness of the Borough. Development should take place within the environmental capacity of its locality and in proportion to its location within the hierarchy of settlements in the Borough. Development will be required to maximise the conservation of land, energy and resources and should be designed to a high standard, taking advantage of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area.</p> <p>This is to be achieved through the careful management of the natural and built environment, close liaison with the Environment Agency and Natural England and the implementation of policies which reflect the principles of sustainable development. These policies will require development to be well located and focused on previously developed land wherever possible, reflecting the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy. Policies will be required which cover:</p> <p>Protection and enhancement of natural and historic assets (Policy CS11) Environmental Impact of Development (Policy CS13) Efficient Use of Natural Resources (Policy CS14) The location and supply of new homes (Policy CS1) Scale and Distribution of Employment Land (Policy CS7) Development and Accessibility (Policy CS20) Together with more detailed design and amenity policies in the Site Allocations and Development Control Policies DPDs</p> |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| demographically | | | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | Making efficient use of land should have a slight positive long term effect on maximising the conservation of land | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Protecting and enhancing the natural environment should have a moderate long term positive effect on reducing contamination and safeguarding soil quality | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | Protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment should have a strong long term positive effect. | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | See assessment for objective 9 | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | The emphasis on protecting the natural environment and maximising energy use in the policy should have a slight positive long term effect. | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | See assessment for objective 9 | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | See assessment for objective 9 | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | As developments will be required to maximise the conservation of resource, this should have a moderate long term positive effect | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | See assessment for objective 9 | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | See assessment for objective 9 | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | The requirement for developments to maximise the conservation of energy should have a slight positive long term effect | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | See assessment of objective 17 | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | The requirement for developments to maximise the conservation of energy and resources should have a slight positive long term effect | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Protection of the natural environment and requirements to maximise the conservation of energy and resources should have a slight positive long term effect. | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The overall aim of the policy should have a slight positive long term effect | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Policy SP2 A Safe and Inclusive Environment</p> | <p>New development will be required to create places which are safe and secure, thereby reducing crime and the fear of crime. To achieve this, development will also be expected to contribute to the promotion of social inclusion by ensuring accessibility of key services to all sections of the community, including those with reduced levels of mobility.</p> <p>This is to be achieved through close liaison with Hertfordshire Constabulary on key development proposals, the careful management of town centre uses and the incorporation of secure by design principles in new development. The creation of a safer environment will require measures to promote social inclusion, including the safeguarding of key local services and the location and design of new facilities where they can be accessed by all sections of the community who need to use them. Policies will be required which cover:</p> <p>Safe and Attractive Evening Economy (Policy CS26) Access to Services (Policy CS15) Key Community Facilities (Policy CS16) Accessible buildings (Policy CS19) Development and Accessibility (Policy CS20) Together with more detailed design and security policies in the Site Allocations and Development Control Policies DPDs</p> |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | Promotion of accessibility for all sections of the community will have a moderate positive long term effect. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not needed as positive | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | Emphasis on social inclusion as part of the policy will have a slight positive long term effect reducing social exclusion and promoting equality of opportunities | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | There are many aspects to reducing poverty, including provision of affordable housing and employment, and as such promotion of social inclusion will only contribute to part of the solution. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | This is one of the main aims of the policy and should have strong long term positive effects | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not needed as positive | |
| 6 | To improve population's health | Creating safe and secure places will have | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | Improvements to the population's health will also be |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---|---|---|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | a slight positive long term effect on the population's health by reducing possible injury from crime, traffic and other accidents. | | | | | connected with diet and levels of physical exercise which is dependent on the provision of open space and sports/recreation facilities. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Creating safe and secure places should have a slight positive long term effect on reducing dependence on the private car. | + | + | + | Not needed as positive Private cars maybe used in certain areas or at certain times of day because people do not feel safe and secure using other forms of transport. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Living and working in places that feel safe and secure should have a slight positive long term effect on providing a stable economy | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | A safe and secure environment will encourage people to regularly contribute to the economy, as well as reducing the need for unexpected expenditure on repairs for areas vandalised or damaged. |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The policy will have a strong positive long term effect on sustaining viability and vitality. | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not needed as positive | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Policy SP3 Promoting healthier communities and leisure and cultural opportunities</p> | <p>Proposals which maintain and improve the stock of social, educational, sports and leisure facilities for the local community will be supported by the Council. Where development cannot take place within the limits of existing community infrastructure, additional local provision should be made on both allocated and windfall development sites.</p> <p>This is to be achieved through close liaison with key local service providers, including Hertfordshire County Council and the Primary Care Trust and the introduction of a planning tariff on new housing development, alongside conventional s106 agreements. The phasing of major new developments will be important as will the implementation of policies requiring shortfalls in community facilities to be addressed, as part of planning proposals, will be needed. Policies will be required which cover:</p> <p>Phasing of Housing Development (Policy CS2) Access to Services (Policy CS15) Key Community Facilities (Policy CS16) Securing mixed use development (Policy CS17) Planning Tariff and Obligations (Policy CS18) Promoting alternatives to the car (Policy CS22) Together with site-specific requirements in the Site Allocations DPD</p> |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | As improving the stock of educational facilities is a main aim of the policy, it should have a moderate long term positive effect. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not needed as positive | Policy is more education based rather relating to training and opportunities for employability. This is the reason for a moderate not strong positive effect. |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | Maintaining and improving the stock of a range of community facilities should have a slight long term positive effect on ensuring access. | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | Improving community's facilities should have a slight positive long term effect on reducing poverty and social exclusion. | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | Improving the stock of facilities may have a slight positive indirect long term effect on crime and fear of crime. | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | Improving facilities, making them more safe and secure is likely to deter crime and reduce the perception of crime in the area, particularly if facilities have been vandalised and damaged. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | This is the overriding aim of this policy and should have a strong positive long term effect | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not needed as positive | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Maintaining and improving community facilities may have a slight indirect long term positive effect on reducing dependence on private cars. | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | By providing community facilities locally, people should not have the need to travel and dependence on private cars to access such facilities. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | Maintaining and improving community facilities should have a slight positive long term effect on sustaining and enhancing vitality of town centres. | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Policy SP4 opportunities and development | Employment and economic | <p>The Council will support proposals which attract commercial investment, maintain economic competitiveness and provide employment opportunities for the local community. The provision of training opportunities for the local workforce will be encouraged and sought as part of new employment development in the Borough.</p> <p>This is to be achieved through the retention and protection of a significant stock of business accommodation across the Borough, working with the South West Hertfordshire Business Partnership and other stakeholders to identify local business and training requirements. Policies will be required which cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scale and Distribution of Employment Land (Policy CS7) ▪ Local Significant Employment Sites (Policy CS8) ▪ Land Use within Employment Areas (Policy CS9) ▪ Promoting Film and Television Production in Hertsmere (Policy CS10) ▪ Securing mixed use development (Policy CS17) ▪ Planning Tariff and Obligations (Policy CS18) |
|---|--------------------------------|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | Provision of training opportunities for the local workforce should have a slight long term positive effect | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | Attracting commercial investment and providing employment opportunities should have a slight positive long term effect on reducing poverty. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Provision of employment opportunities is only one part of reducing poverty, in order to eliminate it education, affordable housing and further community facilities need to be provide as well. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | geographically and demographically | | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | Identifying the need to retain business accommodation should have a slight positive long term effect on making the most efficient use of land | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | and recycling of waste | | | | | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The overall aim of the policy to provide employment opportunities and economic development will have a strong positive long term effect | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | Provision of training and employment opportunities for the local community and commercial investment should have a slight positive long term effect | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Policy SP5 Meeting local housing needs</p> | <p>The Council will increase the supply of new housing the Borough by supporting new housebuilding schemes on sites in sustainable locations, with a focus on development within Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey. The provision of adaptable and affordable homes for the local community will be sought in all locations and suitable proposals from social rented landlords will be supported, alongside the provision of affordable homes on privately developed sites.</p> <p>This is to be achieved through an understanding of local housing needs and the implementation of policies which seek to increase overall housing supply for all sections of the community, including increased levels of affordable and lifetime homes. Working with Registered Social Landlords, the Council will need to ensure that new social housing remains genuinely affordable for the local community in perpetuity. Policies will be required which cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The location and supply of new homes (Policy CS1) ▪ Phasing of Housing Development (Policy CS2) ▪ Affordable Housing (Policy CS3) ▪ Affordable Housing in rural areas on exception sites (Policy CS4) ▪ Gypsy and Traveller Sites (Policy CS5) ▪ Housing Mix (Policy CS6) |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This is the overriding aim of the policy and should have a strong positive long term effect | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not needed as positive | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | Provision of affordable housing to be sought at all locations will have a slight positive long term effect on reducing poverty and social exclusion | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | Ensuring a supply of new and affordable housing should have a slight indirect positive long term effect on the populations health | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | An important part of having a healthy population is providing them with safe and comfortable housing |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use | Emphasis on using sustainable locations | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | Using previously developed land and existing buildings is |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | for new housing should have a slight positive effect on making efficient use of land. | | | | | more sustainable than moving to green belt for new housing. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | See assessment for objective 7 | + | + | + | Not needed as positive | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Table E2: Housing Policies

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy CS1 – the Location and Supply of new Homes | <p>The Council will make provision for 4,200 new homes (at an average annual housebuilding rate of 210 homes) in accordance with the requirements of the draft East of England Plan for the period 2001 – 2021 or any higher housing target set in the final Plan, up to a maximum of 5,000 new homes. In providing for a target of 4,200 homes and identifying new locations for development, the Council will take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) environmental constraints; ii) the density of the surrounding area; iii) the need to retain existing housing; iv) the need to locate new development in the most accessible locations; v) the settlement hierarchy identified in the Hertsmere Core Strategy; and vi) the need to locate development within the boundaries of existing built-up areas. <p>The identification of land beyond existing built-up areas for any increased housing target, should continue to be based on criteria (i) to (v).</p> |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term

0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---------------|--|--|----|----|---------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | The focus in this policy to constraint new homes within existing housing areas or in the most accessible locations will ensure to a certain extent that housing is sited in areas where services and facilities are accessible. These positive effects are likely to be permanent, long term and significant. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | <p>The scale and significance of these effects are likely to be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD when the location of housing sites is allocated.</p> <p>By locating new developments in existing areas and in most accessible locations, it is likely that these areas are already well served by key services, and located within distance of transport links and employment opportunities.</p> |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | An additional 4,200 homes over the plan period at a build rate of 210 is greater than the existing allocation and build rate and as such the policy should assist in enabling identified housing needs to be met. These positive effects are likely to be permanent, long term and significant. Identifying the need in this policy to retain existing housing will also support this objective. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of these effects are likely to be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD when the location of housing sites is allocated. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|----|------|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | By allocating sufficient sites to meet this target of 4,200, the policy should help to ensure that land is available to provide the requisite amount of new homes which should help to combat poverty and provide greater equality of housing opportunities. The scale and significance of the positive effects will depend on the location of the allocated housing sites but effects are likely to be permanent and long term. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The Site Allocations DPD will identify the housing sites and as such, will confirm the scale and significance of the positive effects and will depend on the extent to which allocated sites are included in areas of deprivation. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required as positive. | Designing out crime should be encouraged for all new housing developments. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The policy is likely to have a positive effect by focussing development initially on brownfield sites in Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey. Additionally, the approach of redistributing some vacant or potentially vacant employment land, accepting some house building within existing residential areas at densities closer to 40 homes per hectare, and accepting some house building within existing residential areas with an average of 1.5 parking spaces will contribute towards making the most efficient use of previously developed land. There is a degree of uncertainty for the potential for negative effects through the requirement to develop on greenfield sites. This is largely in relation to the final housing target set under the East of England Plan for Hertsmere. Under the preferred policy of 4,200 homes, there would be no requirement to develop greenfield sites, however if the East of England Plan adopts a higher target, there would be a requirement to develop greenfield sites beyond those sites identified in scenario 2 of the Urban Capacity Study. The potential for a negative effect is related to the housing targets contained in the Final East of England Plan, however there remains the possibility for negative effects in the long term. | ++ | ++ | ++/- | If the East of England Plan adopts a higher housing target a negative effect on developing greenfield sites is largely unavoidable, as the current policy provides a strong emphasis on making the best use of previously developed land and buildings and long term negative effects may be unavoidable (assuming a higher housing target is adopted). (See assessment of CS2 – phasing of development). | Scale of effect is dependent upon the final housing target set in the East of England Plan for Hertsmere (see assessment of CS2 – phasing of development). Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS11 and CS13 |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Provision of 4,200 homes in the borough, may have short term negative effects if contaminated land is disturbed. However once identified this land has been remediated this should lead to long term positive effects. | - | + | + | Mitigation to restore identified contaminated land. The positive effects are likely to be realised through cross-reference to CS13 which seeks to ensure that sites are free from contamination. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS11 and CS13 |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic | There is potential for this policy to have a negative effect on historic buildings through increased residential densities in | - | - | -- | Dependent upon the implementation of Policy CS11 'Protection And Enhancement Of The | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | existing areas in the short to medium term, and on landscape character, archaeological sites and cultural features in the long term through greenfield development. However, these effects may be adequately mitigated by Policy CS11. The scale of effect is largely dependent on the detailed implementation of Policy CS11. | | | | Natural And Historic Environment'. | policies notably CS11 and CS13 |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | See assessment of SA objective 9 above. There is a potential for a negative effect in the long term through the potential need for greenfield development to meet higher housing targets, with a potential negative effect on the quality of the countryside and landscape. The effects may be adequately mitigated by Policy CS11; however this would be largely dependent on the detailed implementation of this policy. | 0 | 0 | -- | Dependent upon the implementation of Policy CS11 'Protection And Enhancement Of The Natural And Historic Environment'. Additional mitigation may be required in providing additional areas of natural greenspace that may be lost, such as through the provision of Country Parks. | Scale of effect is dependent upon the final housing target set in the East of England Plan for Hertsmere. Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS11. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Provision of housing in key settlements in Hertsmere may reduce the need to travel particularly when located in the most accessible locations and by having housing and key services/facilities in one area. This should have minor positive long term effects. However increasing housing will attract more people which will naturally increase the number of cars in the area with a long term minor negative effect. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Provision of adequate/appropriate additional public transport routes and services to encourage the use of public transport. Possible consideration of car clubs in new housing estates when private car use is still needed. Successful implementation of CS21 which seeks to assess new developments a number of criteria including details of travel plans should minimise negative effects of new development. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS11, CS13 and CS21 |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | See assessment of SA objective 9 above. There is a potential for a negative effect in the long term through the potential need for greenfield development, with a potential negative effect on the quality on undesignated habitats. The effects may be adequately mitigated by Policy CS11; however this would be largely dependent on the detailed implementation of this Policy. | 0 | 0 | - | Non-designated wildlife habitats may be lost through greenfield development, although this is dependent upon the implementation of Policy CS11 and detailed policies within the Development Control Policies DPD. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS11, CS13 and CS21 |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Additional housing will create more waste water with the possibility of having a minor negative effect on both surface and groundwater in the long term. During construction of houses there maybe an increased negative effect in the short term of groundwater contamination from surface run off However Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' may reduce this effect, although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely. | -- | - | - | Use of SUDS to reduce possible effects from increased housing. Mitigation measures during construction to minimise or eliminate contaminated surface run off. See assessment of CS14. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14. |
| 14 | To minimise water | Additional housing will increase water consumption with a | - | - | - | All new development should aim to minimise | Recommendation: suggest cross |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | consumption | <p>long term negative effect.</p> <p>However Policy CS14 "Efficient Use of Natural Resources" may reduce consumption although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely.</p> | | | | <p>water consumption through the provision of water saving devices such as meters or grey-water recycling schemes which should be included as detailed policies within the Development Control Policies DPD.</p> | <p>referencing in this policy to other policies to minimise the negative effects of additional housing development on the environmental objectives.</p> |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | <p>Additional housing; increased waste water production and impermeable surfaces created through new development will increase flood risk with a long term negative effect.</p> <p>However Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' may reduce this risk, although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely.</p> | - | - | - | <p>Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' is likely to go some way towards mitigating the additional risk of flooding. See assessment of Core Policy CS13</p> | <p>New housing in green belts is likely to have a much greater effect on flood risk as natural flood patterns and water movement will be disturbed.</p> <p>In previously developed land flood patterns and water movement have already been altered to some extent.</p> |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | <p>Additional housing with increased energy demand and more vehicle movement will have a negative effect on air quality in the long term.</p> <p>During construction of new housing there will be further short term negative effects on air quality from the disturbance of soil, dust formation and emissions from construction traffic.</p> <p>However CS14 "Efficient Use of Natural Resources" may reduce the impact on air quality through including reference to BREEAM and Building Futures, although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely.</p> | -- | - | - | <p>Mitigation measures to reduce the effects of construction on air quality in the short term.</p> <p>Policy CS14 "Efficient Use of Natural Resources" is likely to go some way towards mitigating the effects on air quality. See assessment of Core Policy CS14.</p> | <p>Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14.</p> |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | <p>Additional housing with increased energy demand and increased traffic volumes will have a negative long term effect.</p> <p>However CS14 "Efficient Use of Natural Resources" may reduce greenhouse gas although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely.</p> | - | - | - | <p>CS13 "Environmental Impact of Development" is likely to go some way towards mitigating the effects on air quality. See assessment of Core Policy CS13.</p> | <p>Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14.</p> |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | <p>Additional housing will increase the need for energy with a negative effect, however Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' may reduce this demand, although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual</p> | - | - | - | <p>Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' is likely to go some way towards mitigating the additional demand for energy. See assessment of Core Policy CS13. CS14 also refers to supporting the development of on-site</p> | <p>Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14.</p> |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | effect is likely. | | | | renewable energy schemes which could support increasing the use of renewable energy. | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | Additional housing will increase waste generation; however Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' may reduce the amount of waste generated, although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely. | - | - | - | Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' is likely to go some way towards mitigating increased waste generation. See assessment of Core Policy CS13. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Additional house building is likely to have direct minor positive effects through providing additional employment in the house building industry. The effect is likely to be long term as a yearly supply of housing is required through this policy. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy CS2 - Phasing of Housing Development | <p>To facilitate a sustainable rate of housebuilding within the Borough under the terms of Policy CS1, the Council will make provision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Up to 656 additional new homes to be permitted in Phase 1 between April 2006 and March 2011 (equivalent to 219 homes per year) - Up to 848 additional new homes to be permitted in Phase 2 between March 2011 and April 2016 (equivalent to 283 homes per year) - Up to 841 new homes to be permitted in Phase 3 between March 2016 and April 2021 (equivalent to 280 homes per year)¹ <p>Should a total housing target of 5,000 homes be set in the East of England Plan, additional sites should be identified in the Site Allocations DPD to enable the provision of a further 103 homes in Phase 2 and 462 homes in Phase 3.</p> <p>Housing sites will be phased on this basis in the Site Allocations DPD to facilitate the required levels of housebuilding sought in the East of England Plan. Based on the findings of the Annual Monitoring Report, allocated land in later phases will be brought forward, where necessary, to maintain the five year supply of land for housing. In order to prevent the overdevelopment of housing in the Borough, the phasing and release of land allocated in the Site Allocations DPD will be reviewed where the number of units permitted on different sites, over any period of three years, significantly exceeds the maximum amounts sought over that period under the terms of this policy. Should the total East of England Plan housebuilding requirements be met during the Plan period, further residential development will not be permitted in the Borough where it results in the net development of more than 15 new units.</p> |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | A phased programme for housing in Hertsmere is likely to ensure the delivery of sustainable communities across Hertsmere ensuring that infrastructure is in place to reduce the burden on existing infrastructure and community facilities which is likely to occur with new housing development. The positive effects are likely to be permanent and occur in the short, medium and long term through the managed release of housing during the plan period. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required. | The availability of supporting infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity in some locations will determine the timing of the release of housing sites. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | A phased programme for housing delivery in Hertsmere is likely to meet the short and medium term requirements for housing in the borough through existing local plan allocations and identified sites in the urban capacity study. In the short and medium term the effects are likely to be positive and permanent. In the longer | ++ | ++ | - | This objective will be monitored through the AMR. | The availability of supporting infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity in some locations will determine the timing of the release of housing sites. |

¹ Annual equivalents may not tally due to rounding

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|-----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | term, when regional housing targets are exceeded, the Council will restrict the amount of new housing and as such, may result in negative effects for future housing needs. | | | | | The Council will monitor housing trajectory on an annual basis through its Annual Monitoring Report and will provide up to date information to inform the five year housing supply in Hertsmere. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | A managed release of housing should enable housing allocation sites to take account of areas of deprivation and use housing development as a catalyst for promoting equality of opportunities for housing. The availability of supporting infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity for community facilities prior to the release of housing may also combat poverty and social exclusion. In the short and medium term the effects are likely to be positive and permanent. However, when regional housing targets are exceeded, the Council will restrict the amount of new housing and as such, may result in negative effects on deprivation in the longer term. | ++ | ++ | - | This objective will be monitored through the AMR. | The Site Allocations DPD will identify the housing sites and as such, will confirm the scale and significance of the positive effects which will depend on the extent to which allocated sites are included in areas of deprivation. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Designing out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. | Designing out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. Positive effects are likely in the short to medium term, however there is potential for a negative effect in the long term. The potential for a negative effect is related to the housing targets contained in the Final East of England Plan, however there remains the possibility for negative effects in the long term. | + | + | +/- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | This policy is closely linked to Core Policy CS1 in terms of providing new housing development during the plan period but refers to the phasing of the housing. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. | - | - | -- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of | - | + | + | See assessment of | As above. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | New Homes' | | | | Core Policy CS1. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. | - | - | -- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. | - | - | -- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. | - | - | -- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The policy is likely to have slight positive effect by ensuring a sustainable rate of house building over the plan period enabling stability in the local construction industry. Additionally, phasing of development will allow for adequate supporting infrastructure to be planned and provided for contributing towards a balanced and stable economy. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy CS3 - Affordable Housing | In order to optimise the supply of affordable housing, developments involving more than 15 residential units, or residential sites of more than 0.5 hectares, should make provision for an element of affordable housing. The proportion of homes on each site which are affordable should comprise 40% of total proposed housing. A lower affordable housing requirement of 35% will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that a higher proportion cannot be realistically accommodated within a site or that it would jeopardise the viability of a scheme. On sites requiring the provision of affordable housing, the Council will seek to maximise the provision of affordable, rented accommodation with at least 75% of affordable homes to be provided in the form of social rented housing, managed through a Registered Social Landlord. |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy is in line with the Community Strategy for Hertsmere which seeks to optimise the supply of affordable housing in the Borough. This policy should result in increased levels of affordable housing on all qualifying sites (i.e. over 15 units) and through a proportion of homes of each site which are affordable (40% or 35%). As such this approach to affordable housing should meet the identified annual net shortfall of 351 units per year. The effects are likely to be positive, long term and significant. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of the positive effects will be confirmed through the SPD on Affordable Housing which will provide clarification on where affordable housing requirement will be considered acceptable and clarify arrangements for delivery, funding and implementation of different affordable housing targets. Monitoring of affordable housing units through the development control process and the AMR. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | The availability of a mix of housing tenure is an important indicator of poverty and quality. This policy is in line with the Community Strategy for Hertsmere which seeks to optimise the supply of affordable housing and also seeks to provide a balanced mix of housing tenure based on identified need. This policy requires on all qualifying sites for a 75%/25% split between social rented and intermediate housing which have been identified | ++ | ++ | ++ | Monitoring of affordable housing units and tenure mix through the development control process and the AMR. | As objective 3. The Site Allocations DPD will identify housing sites and as such, will confirm the scale and significance of the positive effects which will depend on the extent to which allocated sites are included in areas of deprivation. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | through the Housing Needs Study. The effects are likely to be positive, long term and significant. | | | | | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Design out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Provision of affordable housing may reduce the need for some sections of the community to travel so having a long term positive effect on air quality | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Sections of the community such as key workers or others with low income may have reduced reliance on cars if availability of affordable housing means their housing and employment needs are met in the same area |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|--|----|----|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Provision of affordable housing may reduce the need for some sections of the community to travel so having a long term positive effect on greenhouse gas emissions | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Sections of the community such as key workers or others with low income may have reduced reliance on cars if availability of affordable housing means their housing and employment needs are met in the same area |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The policy is likely to have a significant positive effect through the provision of affordable homes, particularly for key workers, which will contribute towards a balanced and prosperous economy. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy CS4 - Affordable Housing in rural areas on exception sites | In all identified settlements in the Green Belt, as set out on the Core Strategy Key Diagram, the Council may permit the development of small scale affordable housing schemes as an exception to normal policies. Such schemes should meet the identified needs of people local to the village or settlement, remain affordable in perpetuity and be managed by a Registered Social Landlord. Priority will be given to sites located on previously developed land within settlements and the scale of development should not exceed the level of need identified. |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | Indirectly, in allowing small scale affordable housing schemes in rural villages, this may make existing facilities more viable or attract small shops to open which will improve access to these facilities for residents of this villages. The positive effects are likely to be minor and will be dependent on extent of development and location. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | Rural exceptions permitted will be based on identified need for affordable housing in the Housing Needs Survey (Shenley, South Mimms and Elstree). This policy provides a mechanism for delivering affordable housing in rural areas where appropriate so should help to secure the delivery of affordable housing in rural villages and meet the identified housing need. In the longer term as housing targets are met this may result in less positive effects than in the short and medium term as there will be restrictions on overall housing. The positive effects will be dependant on the effective implementation of this policy. | ++ | ++ | + | None required as positive. | Recommendation in the options appraisal not taken on board in the preferred policy wording. Suggest additional sentence '...should not exceed the level of need identified or have adverse effects on the natural and built environment'. Alternatively supporting text should refer to a criteria based approach in order to minimise negative effects on the environmental objectives. The scale and significance of the positive effects will be confirmed through the SPD on Affordable Housing. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | There is an identified affordable housing problem in the smaller settlements of Shenley, South Mimms and Elstree. This policy provides a mechanism for delivery of affordable housing in these rural villages which should help to enable less affluent persons to become engaged in rural communities and promoting greater quality of access to housing. The positive effects will be dependant on the effective implementation of this policy. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of the positive effects will be confirmed through the SPD on Affordable Housing. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | Through permitting small scale residential development in rural villages, this may indirectly result in a reduction in crime or fear of crime through natural surveillance. These secondary positive effects are minor and dependant on the effective implementation of this policy. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | Designing out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. |
| 6 | To improve population's health | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | See assessment of Core Policy CS3 Affordable Housing | + | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS3. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | See assessment of Core Policy CS3 Affordable Housing | + | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS3. | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | See assessment of Core Policy CS3 Affordable Housing | + | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS3. | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | See assessment of Core Policy CS3 Affordable Housing | + | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS3. | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The policy is likely to have significant positive effects through the provision of affordable homes, particularly for key workers, which will contribute towards a balanced and prosperous economy. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Policy CP5 - Gypsies and Travellers</p> | <p>The Council will work with neighbouring Local Authorities in south and west Hertfordshire to provide for further needs of Gypsies and Travellers (as defined in Circular 01/06). On the basis of identified need within this area, the Council will seek to provide for a further 15-20 (xx tbc) plots through the identification of land in the Site Allocations DPD. In identifying additional or extended sites, consideration will be based on a range of criteria including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a sequential site selection process with an emphasis on land which has been previously developed; ▪ safe and convenient access to the primary road network with proximity to the major road network and without blocking any existing rights of way ; ▪ avoiding prejudicing residential or rural amenity as a result of visual intrusion, excessive noise, lighting, traffic generation or activity at unsocial hours; ▪ avoiding overdominating and respecting the size and scale of the nearest settled community; ▪ safe and acceptable environmental conditions within the site including the need to avoid air and noise pollution and significantly contaminated land; ▪ an ability to receive essential services including water, sewerage, drainage and water disposal; ▪ location within reasonable proximity to key local services; and ▪ the potential for a site to be effectively landscaped and where necessary, an adequate buffer between the site and any nearby housing |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|-----|----------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This policy seeks to identify land for gypsies and travellers through the Site Allocations DPD. This will be based on a range of criteria one being that the sites are located within a reasonable proximity to key local services. This will ensure access to services and facilities for this section of the community and as such, this policy will have positive, permanent and significant positive effects. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of the positive effects will be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | On the basis of identified need, this policy will allocate sites for gypsies and travellers thus meeting housing need for this section of the community. However, in identifying sites and permitting additional or extended sites based on a range of criteria, this may compromise the availability of land to meet identified housing needs particularly if the housing target in Hertsmere exceeds 4,200 (competing of available land). These negative effects are dependent on the final housing targets for Hertsmere and are likely to be felt in the longer term. | + | + | +/- | | The scale and significance of the effects will be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD and when the RSS14 housing figures are finalised. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social | This policy will identify sites for gypsies and puts forward | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of the positive effects |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | criteria based approach for allocating additional sites and as such, seeks to accommodate the gypsy community in Hertsmere. This policy will contribute to social inclusion of the gypsy and traveller community. In addition, it seeks to promote equality of opportunities by locating sites within a reasonable proximity to key local services. This policy will have permanent positive and significant effects. | | | | | will be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | This criterion based approach seeks to pro-actively manage gypsy and traveller sites through direct allocation and identifying future sites. Allocating specific encampments should help to safeguard against certain crimes. In addition, this policy has the potential to reduce fear of crime through ensuring sites are properly planned and managed. This policy will have positive, permanent and significant effects. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of the positive effects will be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | This policy identifies sites for gypsies and puts forward criteria based approach for allocating additional sites. One such criterion is the ability to receive essential services including water, sewerage drainage and water disposal and as such, this policy ensures that sites are serviced by appropriate sanitation arrangements. In addition, another criterion seeks to ensure that sites are located in accessible locations thus improving opportunities to health care and leisure. Overall this policy will have positive, permanent and significant effects. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | The scale and significance of the positive effects will be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The policy is likely to have a positive effect by adopting a sequential site selection process with an emphasis on land which has been previously developed. There is potential for negative effects if the Site Allocations DPD identifies sites on greenfield land. Overall, the scale of effect is dependent on those sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Policy already emphasises land which has been previously developed. Greenfield development may be unavoidable if demand requires all potential previously developed sites to be utilised. | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Selection of previously developed sites should have a positive effect as any contamination identified in this land should be remediated before development occurs. However there is a potential for a negative effect if the site allocation DPD identifies sites on Greenfield land. This may cause contamination of the site and most likely lead to reduction in soil quality and quantity | +/- | +/- | +/- | Policy already emphasises land which has been previously developed. Greenfield development may be unavoidable if demand requires all potential previously developed sites to be utilised. | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological | The policy has the potential for development on greenfield land which may have negative effects on landscape character and historic assets. However the detailed criteria | - | - | - | Further site specific mitigation may be required such as landscape bunding and planting or | An additional criteria should be added to ensure that sites for additional encampments take into consideration the nature conservation, landscape, |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | sites and cultural features of importance to the community | to be considered (including rural amenity and visual intrusion) have the potential to mitigate potential negative effects. | | | | archaeological site evaluation. | heritage value of sites (potential to cross reference with CS11) and/or ensure that any adverse effects on the built and natural environment are avoided, mitigated and/or compensated. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | See assessment of SA objective 9 above. The policy has the potential for development on greenfield land, however the detailed criteria to be considered (including rural amenity and visual intrusion) has the potential to mitigate potential negative effects. | - | - | - | Further site specific mitigation may be required such as landscape bunding and planting. There is the potential for residual effects on the quality of the countryside that may not be able to be mitigated. | As above. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Location of sites in reasonable proximity to key local services may reduce dependence on private car use with a minor positive effect. However the provision of the sites themselves may attract more people and vehicles to the area undermining the original benefit | +/- | +/- | +/- | Provision of public transport links to identified sites | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | There is potential for small scale development of Greenfield sites which has the potential for a negative effect on undesignated habitats. Effects have the potential to be long term and permanent. | - | - | - | Policy could be strengthened to recognise the need of minimising negative biodiversity effects. | Recommendation: Policy could be strengthened by amending 'safe and acceptable environmental conditions' to include the preservation of local biodiversity interests. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Provision of authorised sites with appropriate infrastructure to manage water, sewage, drainage and water disposal should have a positive effect However if the site allocation DPD identifies sites on Greenfield land even the provision of such infrastructure could cause disturbance and effects on water quality. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Measures to minimise the effect of development on Greenfield land possibly to include SUDS. | Positive effects of providing infrastructure in authorised sites is compared to unauthorised sites where sewage and other waste maybe discharged directly into water courses |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | Where sites are provided with infrastructure to deliver water, there will be a negative long term effect on reducing water consumption. | - | - | - | Possible for the installation of rain water harvesting and grey water recycling systems to minimise water consumption. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | Provision of sites in previously developed areas should not any additional effect on flood risk. However if the site allocation DPD identifies sites on Greenfield land there will be a negative effect as site development would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces in the area | - | - | - | Development decisions must be guided by the principles of PPS25. Flood risk assessments will be required for the development of sites that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. | Recommendation: suggest cross referencing in this policy to other policies notably CS13 and CS14. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | | | | | | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Policy CS6 - Housing Mix | <p>To help meet local housing needs, proposals for new housing should provide an appropriate mix of new homes in terms of housing size and type. Developers should ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 100% of new homes on all sites are built to Lifetime Homes standards, with the exception of schemes involving the conversion of existing buildings resulting in six new units or less; ii) Housing developments in excess of 10 units contain sufficient variation within their housing mix, with sites of at least 25 units or 1 hectare reflecting identified variation within the Borough's housing need; and iii) On particularly large development sites, a proportion of sheltered housing is provided as part of the overall housing mix. <p>The Council will seek to identify land, through the Site Allocations DPD, where sheltered housing can be included as part of any future development.</p> |
|---------------------------------|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This policy should help to support improved accessibility to housing for the mobility impaired with reference to 100% lifetime home standards. The effects are likely to be minor and permanent and not significant. See assessment of CS Policy 19. | + | + | + | None required. | Cross reference to CS Policy 19 in criterion (i). |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy includes a mechanism to provide homes to meet the needs of those with mobility difficulties and those requiring sheltered housing resulting in positive permanent effects increasing during the plan period. See assessment of CS Policy 19. | + | ++ | ++ | None required. | Cross reference to CS Policy 19 in criterion (i). |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | This policy should help to ensure that an increased amount of homes meet the needs of certain disadvantaged groups such as the mobility impaired and those requiring sheltered accommodation or small units. This is likely to have some positive effects in terms of increasing equality of opportunity and reducing social exclusion resulting in positive permanent effects increasing during the plan period. See assessment of CS Policy 19. | + | ++ | ++ | None required. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | | | | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Provision of an appropriate mix of housing may reduce dependence on the car and the need to travel , through providing appropriate housing and employment in close proximity | + | + | + | None required as positive. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Provision of a range of housing mix for different sectors of the community is likely to complement the existing workforce as well as encourage others including those low skilled workers. Effects are likely to minor but permanent. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Table E3: Economic Policies

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Policy CS7 - Scale and Distribution of Employment Land</p> | <p>In order to encourage economic development and promote a competitive local economy, provision will be made for the supply of at least xx ha of designated employment land for B-class development within the Borough up to 2021, focused on the following locations and as identified on the Key Diagram:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Employment Areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elstree Way, Borehamwood ▪ Stirling Way, Borehamwood ▪ Cranborne Road, Potters Bar ▪ Station Close, Potters Bar ▪ Otterspool Way, Bushey <p><u>Key Employment Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Centennial Park, Elstree <p>The boundaries of these locations will be clarified in the Site Allocations DPD including the release of existing sites within these areas for new housing or housing-led mixed-use development where appropriate. Any release of designated employment land for housing-led or mixed-used development, during the plan period, will be based on an assessment of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) there is any realistic prospect of that land being developed or occupied for employment purposes during the plan period; ii) the development of a particular site during the plan period would lead to an over-supply of housing; iii) the environmental, locational and physical characteristics of the current site or use are appropriate for continued employment use; iv) an acceptable environment can be provided for housing-led development, including its impact on local traffic levels; v) a housing-led development would prejudice the ability of nearby businesses to operate; and whether vi) the employment land release would prejudice the implementation of the Elstree Way Corridor Planning and Design Brief and other Council economic development and regeneration strategies. |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | By focusing new employment use in existing established employment areas will ensure accessibility for opportunities for | ++ | ++ | ++ | | In combination with sustainable transport policies (CS20 and 21), opportunities for accessibility are likely to be enhanced significantly. The scale and |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | employment in areas of good accessibility. The positive effects are likely to be permanent and be consistent in the short, medium and long term. | | | | | significance of these positive effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy allows for the release of existing employment sites for new housing where appropriate through the Site Allocations DPD. The release of sites would contribute to providing sites to meet identified housing targets and housing needs resulting in overall positive effects. The effects are assessed as being minor and dependent on the findings of the urban capacity study and employment study and the likely shortfall/surplus in both housing and employment uses. | + | + | + | | The scale and significance of these positive effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD where the boundaries of existing employment and housing sites are identified. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | Redistribution of land may result in more efficient use of land in general with employment land being situated in suitable areas and vice versa with housing land. This will have a minor positive effect. However, the policy will result in Greenfield release for employment use thus conflicting with this objective with a negative effect. | +/- | +/- | +/- | The amount of greenfield land development is dependent on the demand for new housing and employment land. Negative effects on this objective are unlikely to be mitigated if regional housing and employment targets are to be met. | Development of Greenfield land for new employment uses is dependent on the setting of regional housing and employment growth requirements. In order to meet both housing and employments, as they currently exist, a similar amount of Green Belt land would need to be developed either for employment development or new homes. The scale and significance of these effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD where the boundaries of existing employment and housing sites are identified. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | The loss of poorly located employment sites or sites within housing areas presents the opportunity for decontamination of land and improvements to soil quality locally. The application of CS Policy 13 will allow for remediation of contaminated land. The re- | +/- | +/- | +/- | Mitigation measures during construction and operation to minimise contamination risk. | The scale and significance of the negative effects will be dependent on the scale and nature of contamination if any is found and the successful implementation of CS 13. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | distribution of employment sites will seek to safeguard soil quality and quantity elsewhere. The effect will be positive but not significant. | | | | | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | The development of additional Greenbelt land for employment use is likely to have a significant negative effect on landscape character and visual openness through the development of Greenbelt sites. The effect is likely to be more pronounced in the medium to long term as additional employment land is required. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | - | -- | -- | Although the key diagram identifies 'areas of search' for new or intensified designated employment land, and that the extension of an Employment Area is likely to be less intrusive than the equivalent expansion of an existing urban or rural area, residual effects would require mitigation. The design of development should reflect the local landscape and historical character, along with measures such as planting, landscape bunding and biodiversity enhancements to minimise negative effects. | <p>The scale and significance of these effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD where the boundaries of existing employment and housing sites are identified.</p> <p>The negative effects of new development identified could be minimised by adding an additional criterion to ensure that adverse effects on the built and natural environment are avoided and/or mitigated/compensated. Cross referencing to Core Policy 11 could also help to off set the negative effects identified.</p> <p>Also suggest cross referencing to CS Policy 1: Location and Supply of housing as it is likely in the longer term that these key uses will be competing for land.</p> |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | The development of additional Greenbelt land for employment use is likely to have a significant negative effect on the quality of the countryside through the development of Greenbelt sites. The effect is likely to be more pronounced in the medium to long term as additional employment land is required. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | - | -- | -- | See mitigation for SA objective 9. | As above. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Provision of employment land in settlements should reduce the need for travel between housing and employment. There maybe some short term negative effects while routes are established between new employment land and housing and reliance is still partly on the private car. In the medium to long term this should improve resulting in minor positive, permanent but not significant effects. | -/+ | + | + | Early development of work travel plans to minimise short term negative effects. Establishment of good, frequent and reliable public transport links. | Cross reference to Core Policy CPTP1 relating to encouraging green travel plans. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | The development of additional Greenbelt land is likely to have a slight negative effect on undesignated habitats through the development of Greenbelt sites. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | - | - | - | See mitigation for SA objective 9. | The scale and significance of these effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD where the boundaries of existing employment and housing sites are identified. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | | The negative effects identified could be minimised by adding an additional criterion to ensure that adverse effects of new development on the built and natural environment are avoided and/or mitigated/compensated. Cross referencing to Core Policy 11 could also help to off set the negative effects identified. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | The redevelopment of poorly located employment sites may result in localised surface water run-off and pressure on existing water treatment systems. The effect will be positive but not significant. | - | - | - | Mitigation measures during construction and operation to minimise pollution risk. | Successful implementation of Core Policies 13 and 14 should help to minimise the effects of new development. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Reference to BREEAM offices during design to minimise water consumption. See CS Policy 14. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | Development of designated employment land for housing and vice versa is likely to increase pressure on drainage systems and potentially increase the risk of flooding. The effects are likely to be negative and permanent but the significant of the effect will depend on the location and extent of redevelopment of employment sites for housing. | - | - | - | Development decisions must be guided by the principles of PPS25. Developments should also be designed to be capable of withstanding flood events i.e. by identifying appropriate ground and basement floor uses. Flood risk assessments will be required for the development of sites that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. | Successful implementation of Core Policies 13 and 14 should help to minimise the effects of new development. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of employment land in established settlements would have a minor positive effect on air quality on a permanent basis. The positive effect if existing areas are of high public transport accessibility. However during construction there maybe some negative effects on air quality in the short term. | +/- | + | + | Measures to reduce any pollution during the construction phase through the implementation/reference to a Construction and Environment Management Plan. | Successful implementation of Core Policy 14 should help to minimise the effects of new development. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of employment land in accessible locations would have a minor positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the long term. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Reference to BREEAM office to ensure good design which promotes energy efficiency. Recommend cross referencing to Core Policy 22 in promoting alternatives to the car and ensuring green travel plans are in place in new development (CS Policy 21) to strengthen policy. Successful |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | | implementation of such policies should contribute to this objective. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The redistribution of employment sites on the basis of improving the ease and attractiveness of development (through selective release of sites and greenfield release) should help to increase take up of employment sites for development as well as enabling development of former employment sites for alternative uses. Significant positive effects are likely to be Borough wide. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The release of constrained employment sites within town centres for alternative forms of development may have benefits for town centre vitality and viability through enabling beneficial development of vacant/under-used sites, for example for housing or leisure uses. Significant positive effects are likely to be permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy CS8 - Local Significant Employment Sites | In order to sustain a competitive local economy with good access to employment for the local population, the Council will seek to maintain a supply of smaller, business units across the Borough. The Council will work with key partners, including the South West Hertfordshire Business Partnership and local Chambers of Commerce, to identify Local Significant Employment Sites. These sites will comprise economically viable business accommodation over 0.25 hectares with satisfactory access, parking and environmental conditions, for B-class and other identified, employment generating uses. Any redevelopment of a Locally Significant Employment Site for housing or other development will be based on an assessment of the criteria in Policy CS7. |
|--|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | By maintaining a supply of smaller business units by identifying Local Significant Employment Sites, may ensure accessibility to this type of employment opportunities. The positive effects are likely to be minor, permanent but not significant | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | | | | | | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Providing business units throughout the borough, reducing the need for some of the population to travel or rely on private cars should have a permanent long term minor positive effects However there maybe some short term temporary negative effects while routes are established between new employment land and housing and reliance is still on the private car. | -/+ | + | + | Early development of work travel plans to minimise short term negative effects. Establishment of good, frequent and reliable public transport links. | Recommend cross referencing to Core Policy 22 in promoting alternatives to the car and ensuring green travel plans are in place in new development (CS Policy 21) to strengthen policy. Successful implementation of such policies should contribute to this objective. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Reduction of private car use may reduce pollution in road run off which would have a minor positive effect on improving water quality on a long term basis. However there maybe some short term minor negative effects while routes are established between new employment land and housing and reliance is still on the private car. | +/- | + | + | Early development of work travel plans to minimise short term negative effects. Establishment of good, frequent and reliable public transport links. | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Reference to BREEAM offices during design to minimise water consumption (see CS Policy 14). |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | Any development involving impermeable surfaces will increase surface run off and flood risk. Adverse effects should be minimised through the effective implementation of CS Policy 13. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of business units would have a minor positive effect on air quality. However during construction there maybe some minor negative temporary short term effects on air quality, as well as while routes are established and there is some remaining reliance on the private car. | +/- | + | + | Measures to reduce any pollution during the construction phase. Early implementation of work travel plans (CS Policy 21). | Recommend cross referencing to Core Policy 22 in promoting alternatives to the car and ensuring green travel plans are in place in new development (CS Policy 21) to strengthen policy. Successful implementation of such policies should contribute to this objective. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas | Reduction in car use and the need to travel | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Reference to BREEAM office to ensure good design |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | emissions | due to provision of business units distributed across the district would have a slight positive permanent effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | | | | | which promotes energy efficiency (see CS Policy 14). Proving business units around the borough would reduce the need for certain sections of the community to travel or travel as far for employment, enabling a contribution to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in combination with CS Policies 21 and 22. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | The encouragement of renewable energy schemes in new development through CS Policy 14 could result in this policy achieving positive effects. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | By seeking to maintain a supply of smaller business units across the Borough the policy will have a significant positive effect on providing a prosperous, balanced and stable economy by protecting the major employment generating uses in the borough. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The retention of smaller business units will have a slight positive indirect effect on sustaining the viability and vitality of town centres by maintaining the mix of uses within town centres (where employment currently exists) and maintaining economic activity in and adjacent to town centres. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|--|
| CS9- Land Use within Employment Areas | <p>Activities within designated Employment Areas will be limited to office, industrial, warehousing and other B-class uses. Any new office development exceeding 2,500 sq m within Employment Areas will be limited to the Elstree Way, Borehamwood Employment Area, subject to meeting environmental and other relevant DPD / Local Plan Policies.</p> <p>Certain other uses will also be permitted within Employment Areas, comprising waste management, builders merchants, film / television studios and production, and car dealerships and trade counter operations where the extent of any (non-trade) retail or sales activity display remains ancillary to the principal use of the site.</p> |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | By allowing a diversification of employment types in existing employment areas this may ensure accessibility to a diverse range of employment opportunities. The positive effects are likely to be minor, permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | During construction on selected sites there maybe short term minor negative effects from disturbing soil which maybe contaminated. In the medium to long term | - | -/+ | -/+ | Mitigation measures during construction and operation to minimise contamination risk associated with the waste | Magnitude of the negative effect in the short term relating to construction and the medium to long term relating to land use will be dependent on the scale and nature of contamination if any is found |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---------------|---|---|----|----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| | <p>identification and treatment of contaminated land should have a minor positive effect.</p> <p>However there maybe a minor negative effect, medium to long term during operation of the site of further contamination events particularly if land is used for waste management.</p> | | | | management facilities. | <p>or caused.</p> <p>This policy should cross reference to CS Policy 13 to ensure that contaminated land is remediated.</p> | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Possible risk of slight to moderate negative effects on ground water on a short to long term basis if land within existing employment areas is used for waste management. This could have indirect effects and cause a potential risk of contamination of nearby water courses. | - | -- | -- | Measures to ensure that contamination events do not occur and if they do that their effect is minimised. | <p>The magnitude and duration of negative effects would be dependent on whether waste management was allowed on sites. Other land use is likely to have a far smaller risk associated with it.</p> <p>This policy should cross reference to CS Policy 13 to ensure that contaminated land is remediated.</p> |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | | | | | | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | By limiting activities within employment areas whilst allowing certain other uses provides flexibility within employment sites to meet the needs of the local economy. The significant positive effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy CS10 - Promoting Film and Television Production in Hertsmere | <p>To promote the retention and growth of the film and television production industry in the Borough, the Council will support proposals relating to film and television production and ancillary or associated uses, in Borehamwood. Proposals to refurbish and upgrade the Elstree Film Studios and BBC Elstree Centre will be supported subject to environmental constraints and other relevant policies.</p> <p>In order to facilitate the operational requirements of the film and television production industry, the Council will also seek to make a Local Development Order (LDO) on the principal studio sites. The LDO will grant permission for future, small-scale changes within these sites relating to their primary use as locations for film and television production.</p> |
|--|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | The retention and growth of the film and television industries may promote more opportunities and access to employment opportunities within the film and media industry. The positive effects are likely to be minor, permanent but not significant. | | | | None required as positive. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Through the LDO, designing out crime measures could be incorporated. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of additional film and television facilities on the same site. This would have a minor positive effect on air quality However during construction there maybe some short term minor negative effects on air quality | +/- | + | + | Measures to reduce any pollution during the construction phase. | Link to Core Strategy Policy 22 which aims to promote alternatives to the car. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of additional film and television facilities on the same site would have a minor positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Link to Core Strategy Policy 22 which aims to promote alternatives to the car. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, | By promoting the retention and growth of | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | balanced and stable economy | the film and television production in the borough a major employment generator will be maintained and expanded within the borough with significant positive effects on providing a prosperous, balanced and stable economy. | | | | | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | By promoting the retention and growth of the film and television production in the borough, particularly in Borehamwood and Elstree, indirect positive effects are likely to be maintained on sustaining the viability and vitality of the town centre through the demand for services and facilities from the studios. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Table E4: Open Land and Environment Policies

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy CS13 – Protection and enhancement of the natural and historic environment | <p>All development proposals must conserve and enhance the historic and natural environment, landscape character and bio-diversity in order to maintain and improve environmental quality. Development proposals should be designed to a high quality and not result in significant harm to the openness and appearance of the Green Belt and to identified, protected sites of ecological, geological, historic or archaeological value and will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ there is an over-riding need for the development in the public interest which clearly outweighs the conservation value of the site; ▪ no suitable alternative sites exists to accommodate the development; ▪ adequate mitigation and/or compensatory measures are provided; ▪ in the case of the highest quality agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) and Preferred Areas of mineral extraction, there is no likelihood of the land being sterilised. |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---------------|--|---|----|-----|---------------------------|--|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy provides strict control of the protection of Green Belt and Urban Open Land Areas. This may compromise the ability for Hertsmere to meet identified regional housing targets (5,000). However, this policy does allow certain exceptions to the development of these areas provided that adequate mitigation and/or compensatory measures are provided. Therefore this policy could allow the release of these areas to meet identified housing subject to strict criterion and as such, could have positive effects in the medium and longer term depending on the findings of the urban capacity study. | - | +/- | +/- | | The extent of the positive and negative effects will depend on the findings of the urban capacity study and the extent to which greenbelt release is required in the medium and longer term to meet housing targets. The scale and significance of effects should be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD and when the housing figures in the RSS are finalised. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities | Protecting greenbelt and urban open land from development where possible, offers the opportunity to safeguard their | + | + | - | Any areas of urban open land lost in the future to | The scale and significance of the negative effects will depend on the findings of the urban capacity |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---|---|--|----|----|---|---|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| both geographically and demographically | recreational and connectivity function, which is likely to result in positive effects in the short term. However, if greenbelt and urban open land release is require to meet housing targets, the loss of sites may result in indirect adverse effects as there will be less opportunities for recreational activity. In the short and medium term positive effects are likely to occur however, there may be negative effects in the longer term. | | | | meet the housing targets should be compensated through replacement open land. | study and the extent to which greenbelt release is required in the medium and longer term to meet housing targets. This should be confirmed through the Site Allocations DPD and when the housing figures in the RSS are finalised | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The continued protection of green belt and area of urban open land will have a significant positive effect by constraining development to previously developed land. The positive effect is likely to be long term and in the short and medium terms. Any potential loss in the longer term to meet identified housing targets should be mitigated to a certain extent with this policy. | ++ | ++ | +/- | Not required as effect positive. | This policy could be strengthened through cross referencing to CS1 where the focus for new development is within existing urban areas. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Emphasis for developments to conserve and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity should be complementary to reducing contamination and safeguarding soil. The positive effect is likely to be achieved in the short and medium terms. Any potential loss in the longer term to meet identified housing targets should be mitigated to a certain extent with this policy. | + | + | +/- | Not required as effect positive. | This policy could be strengthened by cross referencing to Policy CS14. <i>'in addition to the objectives of Policy CS14, all development.....'</i> |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | The protection of green belt and urban open land, alongside protected sites of historic or archaeological value will have a direct significant positive effect. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | This policy could be strengthened by separating the built and natural environment into two policies to provide greater emphasis i) protection and enhancement of biodiversity, open space and landscape and ii) protection and enhancement of historic assets (this was suggested at the options appraisal stage). |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | The quality of the countryside and landscape character will be maintained by the policy protecting green belt and areas of urban open land. The effect is likely to be significantly positive, in the short and medium terms. However, the extent to which countryside and open space land may be lost to meet housing targets, there are likely to be negative effects to a certain degree. The policy does outline the need for adequate mitigation measures therefore negative effects should be minor. | ++ | ++ | +/- | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | A need to provide details on how the policy can relate specifically to the objective if appropriate. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | The protection of biodiversity, in addition to the protection of green belt and areas of urban open land will have a significant positive effect on protecting habitats of national and local importance. The effect is likely to be significantly positive, long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | Nature conservation designated sites should be protected for longer term release of greenbelt and open space land as a result of the sequential approach in CS policies 1 and 2 and the successful implementation of this policy. |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|---|----|----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| | | | | | | <p>This policy could be strengthened by being more pro-active rather than reactive in approach i.e. by not referring specifically to the exceptions to this policy but to the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment.</p> <p>This policy could be strengthened by referring specifically to the environmental assets in Hertsmere i.e. nature conservation designated sites, conservation areas etc...</p> <p>This policy could be strengthened by separating the built and natural environment into two policies to provide greater emphasis i) protection and enhancement of biodiversity, open space and landscape and ii) protection and enhancement of historic assets (this was suggested at the options appraisal stage).</p> | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | See assessment of Core Policy 13 and 14. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Protection of the historic and natural environment and landscape character is likely to have a slight positive effect by attracting tourism and recreation uses of areas of green belt and historic attractions. The effect is likely to be slightly positive, long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | Protection of the green belt and urban open land is likely to result in greater concentration of development within existing settlements, which should help to improve their viability through increased demand for services and facilities. The effect is likely to be slightly positive, long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy CS12 - Promoting recreational access to the countryside | <p>The Council will work with its partners and relevant agencies to safeguard, enhance and facilitate access to the local countryside. Measures which secure the provision of safer and more secure car-free access to Watling Chase Community Forest Gateway Sites, Historic Parks and Gardens and countryside attractions will be actively sought. The provision of or enhancement of visitor facilities in the countryside will be encouraged where this:</p> <p>(i) specifically enhances access for the local population (ii) does not harm the character, appearance and openness of the Green Belt; and (iii) does not cause or add significantly to local road congestion.</p> |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This policy through the provision of safe and secure car-free access may have positive effects in providing access to recreational and countryside attractions if these areas are considered essential services and facilities. Effects are likely to be uncertain and not significant and will depend on choice. | + | + | + | None identified. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | Increased accessibility into and through areas of countryside and providing safe access for pedestrians' etc, may contribute to reducing fear of crime through enhanced provision and increase in natural surveillance. Positive effects would be greater if designing out crime measures are incorporated such as enhanced lighting at main areas. Effects however are uncertain and will depend on nature of implementation. Effects are not likely to be significant. | + | + | + | None identified. | Designing out crime prevention measures to be referred to in enhanced access to recreational and countryside areas providing safer places to enjoy. Any measures to provide a safer environment would need to be in accordance with CS Policy 11. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | Increased access and car-free access to the countryside and linkages to urban areas for pedestrian, cyclists and equestrians is likely to have significant secondary positive effects in providing greater opportunities for recreational activity. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None identified. | To monitor visitor number to these areas if possible to ascertain the increase in usage. Monitoring may be possible at Watling Chase Community Forest Gateway if access is controlled. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | before Greenfield sites | | | | | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | The promotion of recreational access to the countryside, whilst ensuring that the enhancement of visitor facilities does not harm the character, appearance or openness of the green belt is likely to have an indirect positive effect on protecting and enhancing landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural facilities of importance to the community. The effect is likely to be slightly positive, long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | To ensure that positive effects are maximised, this policy should be strengthened by referring to CS Policy 11: Protection and enhancement of the environment. Criterion (ii) should be extended to include <i>'does not harm the character, appearance and openness of the greenbelt and landscape, and wider countryside'</i> . This recommendation would achieve greater positive effects. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | This policy aims to ensure that the enhancement of visitor facilities does not harm the character, appearance or openness of the green belt and as such, should have positive effect on maintaining the quality of the countryside and landscape. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Criterion (ii) should be extended to include <i>'does not harm the character, appearance and openness of the greenbelt, landscape and wider countryside'</i> . This recommendation would achieve greater positive effects. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Promotion of safe and secure car free access to sites will have a positive effect on reducing dependence on private car use for recreational activities. Positive effects are likely to be permanent but not unlikely to be significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Successful implementation of CS22 in promoting alternatives to the car should help to achieve the positive effects identified. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | This policy the promotion of recreational access to the countryside, whilst ensuring that the enhancement of visitor facilities does not harm the character, appearance or openness of the green belt has the potential for a slight positive indirect effect on protecting local biodiversity through ensuring facilities do not ham the openness of the green belt. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Another criterion should be added to this policy to ensure that biodiversity is protected and enhanced through the provision and enhancement of visitor facilities. Alternatively this policy should cross reference to CS Policies 11 and 13. These recommendations would achieve greater positive effects. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Promotion of safe and secure car free access to sites will have a positive effect on improving air quality. In addition, improvements to visitors facilities will not be permitted if it would contribute to increasing local congestion. Positive effects are likely to be permanent but unlikely to be significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | As above. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The promotion of recreational access to the countryside is likely to have a slight positive effect by attracting tourism and recreation uses of areas of green belt and historic attractions. The effect is likely to be slightly positive, long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy CS13 - Environmental Impact of Development | <p>The Council will work with key partners, including the Environment Agency and Natural England, to ensure that development proposals do not create an unacceptable level of risk from the impact of natural forces or human activity on occupiers of a site, the local community and the wider environment. Proposals must take particular account of the need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv) mitigate the potential adverse effects of climate change; ii) ensure adequate protection from the risk of on and off-site flooding, including where this is required by the Environment Agency; iv) avoid or mitigate the effects of pollution from noise, lighting, odours and other emissions iv) ensure that land and buildings are free from contamination which might adversely affect human health or the environment; <p>Development proposals must demonstrate that any adverse effects can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation, which are capable of being secured through planning condition or obligation.</p> |
|--|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None identified. | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | The extent to which this policy seeks to protect and enhance the natural environment including adapting to climate change and mitigating the effects of pollution from emissions, this may have indirect positive effects on health, particular in terms of respiratory disorders. The scale and magnitude of these positive effects are uncertain and are likely to be felt in the longer term. | 0 | 0 | + | Difficult to monitor the effects of this policy on improvements in health. | Potentially amend policy wording to refer to the indirect benefits of this policy for human health. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | | | | | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Direct reference to ensuring land and buildings are free from contamination should have a positive effect on reducing contamination. Effects are likely to be permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | There should be a reference in this policy to CS Policy 11: Protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As above. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | There is potential for slight positive effects on enhancing local biodiversity through the encouragement of SUDS, although this is dependent on the implementation of the Building Futures Guide as SPD. The likelihood of positive effects is therefore not certain. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Dependent upon implementation of guidance contained within the Building Futures Guide which is intended to be adopted as SPD. SUDS should be specifically referred to in policy wording itself to strengthen its performance. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Minimising risk to the water environment should have a positive effect on improving water quality. Positive effects are likely to be minor, permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Emphasis in the policy wording to sustainable management of natural resources – suggest rewording. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | Development will increase water consumption. | - | - | - | Reference to BREEAM/ Ecohome standards will have a positive effect through encouraging reduced water consumption | This policy should be reworded to refer to minimising water consumption in new development – through the encouragement of mitigation measures such as water saving devices or grey water systems. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | Direct reference to adequate protection from flooding should have a positive effect on raising the issue of and helping to reduce flood risk. Flood prevention measures and avoiding areas liable to flood, as recommended by the EA, will ensure that development does not impede the flow of water or increase the risk of flooding. In addition, requiring developers | + | + | + | Development decisions must be guided by the principles of PPS25. Developments should also be designed to be capable of withstanding flood events i.e. by identifying appropriate ground and basement floor uses. Flood risk assessments will be | This policy should be strengthened to be more proactive rather than reactive and should include a criterion: <i>'no development in the floodplain unless flood prevention/mitigation measures are in place as required by the Environment Agency'</i> . (this was the preferred policy option during the SA options appraisal). |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | to make provisions for mitigation measures, the policy should have permanent, positive effects in the short, medium and long term. | | | | required for the development of sites that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. | An increase in flooding is an adverse effect of climate change. Suggest deleting criterion (i). SUDS should be specifically referred to in policy wording itself to strengthen its performance. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No specific reference to air quality improvements in existing policy wording. | ? | ? | ? | | Refer to improving air quality through new development in this policy. Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No specific reference to reducing greenhouse gases in existing policy wording. | ? | ? | ? | | Refer to reducing greenhouse gas emissions through new development in this policy, linked with the location of new development. Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. Ensuring that adequate protection from the risk of on and off-site flooding will indirectly have a positive effect on providing a balanced and stable economy. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent, although dependent upon the detailed implementation of the policy and the efficiency of mitigation measures in reducing flood risk. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy CS14 - Efficient Use of Natural Resources | <p>Development proposals should ensure that efficient use is made of natural resources through their layout, design, construction and measures for waste disposal, by incorporating conservation measures and by making the best use of renewable resources. Developments larger than 1,000 sq m or 10 new homes will be required to include measures to off-set 10% of total predicted carbon emissions through a combination of sustainable design and construction and on-site renewable energy generation.</p> <p>To facilitate these requirements, the Council will support the development of on-site recycling facilities and new sources of renewable energy generation where there is no adverse environmental impact on nearby communities.</p> |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No reference to high quality design, unlikely to be any effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Refer to comments on the assessment of environmental objectives and suggested rewording. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | This policy offers the opportunity to realise health benefits through making efficient use of natural resources in the design of buildings creating 'healthier buildings' which may have indirect positive effects in improving health in particular in terms of respiratory disorders. The scale and magnitude of these positive effects are uncertain and are likely to be felt in the longer terms. | 0 | 0 | + | Difficult to monitor the effects of this policy on improvements in health. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not required as effect positive. | Policy requires re-writing to correctly refer to BREEAM standards. BREEAM is a certification systems that needs to relate to one of the specific categories e.g. 'very good' or 'excellent'. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | | Recommendation: Policy is redrafted to refer to the requirement for new dwellings to achieve BREEAM/ Ecohome 'very good' or 'excellent' category. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Neither Building Futures or BREEAM make reference to contamination and/or soil quality, this is dealt with instead by PPS 23 Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Policy requires re-writing to correctly refer to BREEAM standards. BREEAM is a certification systems that needs to relate to one of the specific categories e.g. 'very good' or 'excellent'. Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives and maximise positive effects. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Policy refers to ensuring the efficient use of natural resources through layout, design, construction etc but does not refer to how they aim to achieve this. Although the policy will generally achieve positive effects, the policy wording as it currently stands is vague and therefore weak and underachieves. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | As above. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | As above. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | As above. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | As above. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | By requiring large developments to include measures to off-set 10% of total predicted carbon emissions through a combination of sustainable design and on-site renewable energy generation there is potential for a positive effect. However, the policy does not stipulate how the 10% is to be calculated and therefore provides a low certainty in achieving this. The effect has the potential to be positive, although dependent upon implementation. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Policy does not stipulate how the 10% carbon emissions will be calculated and is inconsistent with the East of England Plan. Recommendation: Policy is redrafted to require the submission of an energy consumption statement in line with East of England Plan requirements. Policy could be strengthened by requiring developments to incorporate equipment for renewable power generation so as to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements. Requirement for an energy assessment (how will they know what 10% of a development's energy needs are without one) |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | Policy refers to ensuring the efficient use of natural resources through layout, design, construction etc but does not refer to how they aim to achieve this. Although the policy will generally achieve positive effects, the policy wording as it currently stands is vague and therefore weak and underachieves. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Suggest combining CS13 and CS14 to strengthen the aims of both objectives and maximise positive effects. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment. A positive effect is likely in that maintenance and enhancement of environmental factor may contribute towards a stable economy. The effect has the potential to be positive, although dependent upon implementation. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Table E5: Building Sustainable Communities Policies

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy CS15- Access to Services | The Council will work with local service providers to facilitate their stated land use and buildings requirements through the identification of mixed-use development opportunities in the Site Allocations DPD. The Council will also require new development to contribute to the Community Strategy aim of ensuring fair access to services and the wider goal of creating a safer and more sustainable environment. New proposals will be assessed against their impact on existing local infrastructure, services and resources, and where necessary, new provision should be made as part of the development in order to meet or fund any shortfall. |
|--|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | The extent to which new provision in development required by this policy comprises educational facilities, this policy is likely to have permanent positive effects, although the likelihood of these effects occurring are not certain and depends on implementation and nature of development coming forward. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | The scale and magnitude of the effects will depend on the successful implementation of this policy and confirmed through the appraisal of the Site Allocations DPD. This policy does not stipulate the type of community facilities in the policy wording. |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This aim of this policy is to ensure fair access to services to contribute to the Community Strategy and create sustainable communities and therefore fully supports this objective. This policy will have permanent positive and significant effects given the flexibility in its wording and the overall aim of improving access to services. | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required as positive. | This policy is highly complementary with the SA objective. The scale and magnitude of the effects will depend on the successful implementation of this policy and confirmed through the appraisal of the Site Allocations DPD. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy assesses new residential proposals against their impact on existing local infrastructure, services and resources. Where there is a shortfall in community facility provision, the Council through this policy will request new provision and as such, may restrict development or restrict affordable housing provision as developers seek to minimise loss of profit. The likelihood of negative effects is uncertain and will depend on location and nature of developments. | - | - | - | Mitigate where possible through S106/tariffs planning obligations (through successful implementation of CS18). | The scale and magnitude of the effects will depend on the successful implementation of this policy and confirmed through the appraisal of the Site Allocations DPD. Recommend cross referencing to CS18: Planning tariffs and obligations. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | opportunities | | | | | | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | This policy in supporting the provision of new community facilities can play a crucial role in combating crime as 'boredom' and 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities. The likelihood of these positive effects occurring is uncertain, as this policy cannot change social behaviour. | + | + | + | Designing out crime in new development should be referred to in order to maximise the positive effects. | Policy should be clearly linked with Hertsmere Crime, Disorder and Drugs Strategy. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | This policy in supporting the provision of community facilities that which may include health care, sporting and leisure opportunities in Hertsmere, is likely to have indirect positive effects on improving health in Hertsmere however, the positive effects are uncertain and secondary on nature. | + | + | + | To monitor the number, type and location of proposals coming forward through the development control process. | Policy should be clearly linked with Hertsmere Crime, Disorder and Drugs Strategy. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Strong emphasis on improved access with assessment on existing local infrastructure, services resources and the environment should indirectly encourage reduction of private car use. Positive effects are likely to be permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | Include specific reference to the reduction of the use of private cars or cross reference to sustainable transport policy (CS20: Development and Accessibility). |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|---|----|----|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Improved access leading to reduced car use will have a positive effect on improving air quality. Effects are likely to be minor, permanent and not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Improved access leading to reduced car use will have a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Effects are likely to be minor, permanent and not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy CS16 - Key Community Facilities | <p>Proposals for the provision or dual use of key community facilities will be supported, subject to any environmental constraints and other relevant policies. Their loss, reduction or displacement will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they are genuinely surplus and that any replacement accommodation is satisfactory for all of its users.</p> <p>The conversion or redevelopment of residential properties for healthcare and elderly care will not be considered appropriate unless it can be demonstrated that there are no other suitable sites or buildings within the service provider catchment.</p> |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | This policy lends strong support to the provision or dual use of key community facilities, which offers the potential to contribute to providing additional venues for education and training. As such, there are likely to be significant permanent positive effects depending on the successful implementation of this policy. | ++ | ++ | ++ | To monitor the number of proposals coming forward as venues for education, training, particularly for adults through the development control process. | Depends on the successful implementation of this policy. This policy does not stipulate the type of community facilities in the policy wording (only supporting text). The positive effects may be greater if the specific community facilities are referred to in the policy wording. |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This policy presents a pro-active support for new uses, protection of existing uses where there is no demonstrated surplus, and the conversion, where appropriate, of residential buildings to provide local community facilities. As such, it presents a flexible approach, which should help to secure better availability and accessibility of services to a wider section of the population in Hertsmere. This policy will have permanent positive and significant effects given the flexibility in its wording. | ++ | ++ | ++ | To monitor the number, type and location of proposals coming forward through the development control process. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | The conversion or redevelopment of residential dwellings to provide local community facilities may have negative effects through taking away housing stock. Conversely, the release of surplus and unused sites for potentially housing use, is likely to contribute to meeting identified housing need. The likelihood of positive or negative effects will depend on individual cases, location and appropriate mitigation for the loss of housing is provided. | +/- | +/- | +/- | | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | A pro-active and flexible approach to community facilities provision may have positive effects on this objective as community and leisure facilities can be important social hubs. The likelihood, scale and magnitude of these positive effects will depend on the location of facilities within identified deprived areas. Overall, effects should be positive in the medium and long term. | 0 | + | + | To monitor the location of proposals coming forward in identified deprived areas through the development control process. | The supporting text should refer to the identified areas of social deprivation in Hertsmere to qualify these positive effects. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | This policy in protecting existing and providing new community facilities can play a crucial role in combating crime as 'boredom' and 'lack of things to do' are often cited as causes for certain criminal activities. The likelihood of these positive effects occurring is uncertain, as this policy cannot change social behaviour. | + | + | + | Designing out crime in new development should be referred to in order to maximise the positive effects. | Policy should be clearly linked with Hertsmere Crime, Disorder and Drugs Strategy. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | This policy provides a mechanism for the pro-active provision of additional facilities that may include health care, sporting and leisure opportunities in Hertsmere, which may have indirect positive effects on improving health in Hertsmere however, the positive effects are uncertain and secondary on nature. | + | + | + | To monitor the number, type and location of proposals coming forward through the development control process. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The conversion of existing buildings and in exceptional circumstances, the adaptation or redevelopment of buildings, will have a positive effect on making the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings. The effect is likely to be non-significant, although long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | landscape | | | | | | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy CCS17 - Securing mixed use development | <p>Mixed-development will be sought on major development sites in Borehamwood and Potters Bar town centres and in any other locations capable of satisfactorily accommodating a range of uses. The ability of any site to accommodate a mix of uses will be assessed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the need for additional services and facilities in an area; ii) the potential to create linkages with other nearby land uses; iii) public transport accessibility and local road capacity; and iv) the impact on the environment within and around the development site <p>The Council will work with in partnership with local service providers, Parish and Town Councils and local community groups, in order to identify the need for additional services and facilities.</p> |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---------------|--|--|----|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | Mixed-use development is likely to be accommodated in areas of good public accessibility and road capacity, which may result in supporting access to services and facilities depending on the nature of the mixed-use development. Residential use however will be provided in accessibility areas. This policy will result in permanent positive effects linking new development to accessible areas but effects are not significant. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | Mixed use development will contribute to meeting housing targets however; mixed use development may compromise maximising housing units in new development which may have medium and longer term negative effects on meeting identified housing need. | + | +/- | +/- | Cross reference to CS Policy 1 – location and scale of development. | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Designing out crime prevention measures should be incorporated into any new development to reduce crime and fear of crime. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | inequalities both geographically and demographically | | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The seeking of mixed use development on major development sites in Borehamwood and Potters Bar is likely to have a positive effect as these development sites are likely to be on previously developed land, although there is no guarantee for this. There is also the potential for negative effects, as it is possible the policy may allow mixed use development on Greenfield sites. The effect is therefore dependent on the implementation of the policy. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Additional criteria referring to making the most efficient use of previously developed land before Greenfield sites may strengthen the policy. | Recommendation: Strengthen criteria as part of policy to include 'the need to make the most efficient use of previously developed land before Greenfield sites'. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Development of land should reduce contamination through the requirement for remediation (in conjunction with Environmental Policy CS13). However there is potential for contamination from the new land use dependent on its nature. It is likely that positive effects will prevail particularly with mitigation measures in place. Overall, the effect is dependant on the implementation of the policy. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Measures to prevent contamination from new land uses. Implementation of a CEMP to reduce the risk of pollution, reference to PPS23 in supporting text. | Reference to assessment proposals on the impact on the environment is not clear. Strengthen criteria or recommend cross referencing with environmental protection policy CS13. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | Scale of effect is dependent upon the implementation of the policy. There is potential for negative effects if mixed-use development is located in areas of sensitive landscape character. Although the policy refers to the 'impact on the environment within and around the development site', the policy is not clear as to what is meant by environment. The effect is therefore dependent on the implementation of the policy. | - | - | - | Additional criteria could be added to strengthen the definition of environment by the policy to refer to protecting landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community. | Recommendation: Strengthen definition of 'environment' in the policy wording by referring to protecting landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | Scale of effect is dependent upon the implementation of the policy. There is potential for negative effects if mixed-use development is located in areas of or adjacent to areas of countryside. Although the policy refers to the 'impact on the environment within and around the development site', the policy is not clear as to what is meant by environment. The effect is therefore dependent on the implementation of the policy. | - | - | - | Additional criteria could be added to strengthen the definition of environment by the policy to refer to maintaining the quality of the countryside and landscape. | Recommendation: Strengthen definition of 'environment' in the policy wording by referring to maintaining the quality of the countryside and landscape. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Mixed use development should reduce the need for any travel by providing housing and services on one site or close by. Any need to travel could then be able to be met by sustainable transport modes. The positive effects are likely to be permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and | Scale of effect is dependent upon the implementation of the policy. There is potential for negative effects if mixed-use development has negative effects on local and non-designated habitats and species. Although the policy refers | - | - | - | Additional criteria could be added to strengthen the definition of environment by the policy to refer to protecting and enhancing wildlife and habitats which are | Recommendation: Strengthen definition of 'environment' in the policy wording by referring to maintaining the quality of the countryside and |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | local scale | to the 'impact on the environment within and around the development site', the policy is not clear as to what is meant by environment. The effect is therefore dependent on the implementation of the policy. | | | | important on an international, national and local scale. | landscape. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Mixed use development reducing the need to travel should have positive effects on improving surface run off. However during construction of the site there will be potential for water pollution. The negative effects are likely to be temporary. Positive effects are likely to be minor and not significant. | - | +/- | +/- | Measures during construction and operation to reduce any potential for water contamination. Implementation of a CEMP to reduce the risk of pollution. | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | Development of any kind will increase water consumption resulting in potential negative effects as policy wording currently stands. The negative effects are likely to be permanent but not significant based on current policy wording. | - | - | - | Reference to BREEAM/ Ecohome standards will have a positive effect through encouraging reduced water consumption. Cross reference with environmental policy CS14. | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | Development of any kind will increase flood risk, to a greater extent if the mixed use is located with the floodplain. New development will require mitigation sought through the application of CS Policy CPOL3 and PPS25. The likelihood of effects occurring is uncertain at this stage. | ? | ? | ? | Development decisions must be guided by the principles of PPS25. Developments should also be designed to be capable of withstanding flood events i.e. by identifying appropriate ground and basement floor uses. Flood risk assessments will be required for the development of sites that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. | Recommendation: Strengthen definition of 'environment' in the policy wording by referring to minimising the risk of flooding or cross reference to relevant CS policy CS13. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Mixed use development should reduce the need for any travel by providing housing and services on one site or close by. Any need to travel could be met by sustainable transport modes. The positive effects are permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Mixed use development should reduce the need for any travel by providing housing and services on one site or close by. Any need to travel could be met by sustainable transport modes. The positive effects are permanent but not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|----|----|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Mixed-use developments have the potential for a positive effect on contributing towards a prosperous and stable economy by incorporating employment, community and residential uses close together and contributing towards a stable economy. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | Town Centres in Borehamwood and Potters Bar are likely to gain increased population and additional services which should help to improve their viability through increased demand for services and facilities. The effect is likely to be slightly positive, long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Policy CS18 - Planning Tariff and Obligations</p> | <p>Provision for on and off-site facilities, services and improvements, for which a need is known to arise from new residential development, will be secured through a fixed tariff on the approval of each new home. The tariff will be set at a suitable level to ensure that the development of new housing does not adversely affect existing facilities and services, having regard to the viability of developing land in the Borough.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing together with on and off-site facilities, training, services and improvements necessitated by new commercial development, will be secured through planning conditions and obligations entered into by the Council and developers under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act and related or equivalent legislation.</p> <p>Specific details on arrangements for securing a planning tariff and planning obligation will be set out in the Planning Tariffs and Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p> |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---------------|--|--|----|----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | This policy offers the opportunity to ensure that developers making contributions are required to make financial contributions which could be used to fund educational provision but this will depend, as stipulated in the policy wording, on whether a need is known and as such, will depend of scale of development. Minor positive effects are likely to occur in the medium and longer term but not significant. | 0 | + | + | None identified. Monitor the nature of fixed tariff or planning obligations sought for new development through the development control process. | The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This policy offers the opportunity to ensure that developers making contributions are required to make financial contributions | 0 | + | + | None identified. Monitor the nature of fixed tariff or planning obligations sought for new | As above. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | which could be used to fund improvements in accessibility but this will depend, as stipulated in the policy wording, on whether a need is known and as such, will depend of scale of development. Minor positive effects are likely to occur in the medium and longer term but not significant. | | | | development through the development control process. | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy through S106 agreements supports the provision of affordable housing which could support this objective resulting in minor positive and permanent effects. However, affordable housing provision is not given a strong enough policy by incorporating it into a general policy on tariffs and planning obligations. | + | + | + | None required as positive. | It is recommended that affordable housing is a separate core strategy policy to provide stronger control over its provision. The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | Tariffs and planning obligations could be used to deliver community health care, sporting and leisure provision, which would contribute to this objective. The scale and magnitude of these positive effects will depend on the nature of the tariffs and planning obligations sought. | 0 | + | + | None identified. Monitor the nature of fixed tariff or planning obligations sought for new development through the development control process. | The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | landscape | | | | | | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Provision of facilities and services through tariffs and obligations may generate sufficient funding to enhance sustainable transport options however, this will depend on the nature of obligations sought/provided and as such, the positive effects are uncertain. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | Improvements to the Watling Chase Community Forest specified under the supporting text to the policy through planning obligations are likely to have a slight positive effect on enhancing biodiversity. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Provision of facilities and services through tariffs and obligations maybe include waste water infrastructure improvements. However construction and operation of any development site may cause pollution water pollution. The extent of the positive and negative effects depends on implementation. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Ensure measures are used during construction and operation of sites to reduce pollution potential. | Cross reference to CS Policies 13 and 14. Successful implementation of these policies should ensure that negative effects are minimised. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | Development of any kind will increase flood risk resulting in negative effects. Planning obligations could include the provision of SUDS and flood alleviation measures to reduce the risk of flooding. Policy CS13 'Environmental Impact of Development' may reduce this risk, although the degree to which this occurs will be dependent upon the implementation of this policy. However, a negative residual effect is likely. | - | - | - | Development decisions must be guided by the principles of PPS25. Developments should also be designed to be capable of withstanding flood events i.e. by identifying appropriate ground and basement floor uses. Flood risk assessments will be required for the development of sites that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. | Cross reference to CS Policies 13 and 14. Successful implementation of these policies should ensure that negative effects are minimised. The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Provision of facilities and services at appropriate locations should reduce the need for travel. Remaining need to travel should then be met by sustainable transport modes | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. As above. Cross reference to transport policies |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Provision of facilities and services at appropriate locations should reduce the need for travel. Remaining need to travel | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | should then be able to be met by sustainable transport modes | | | | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | Improvements to recycling facilities specified under the policy are likely to have a slight positive effect on encouraging the recycling of waste. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Tariffs and S.106 agreements have the potential for a significant positive effect through the provision of a range of community facilities and infrastructure improvements to support a balanced and stable economy. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through Planning Tariffs and Obligations SPD. |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | Tariffs and S.106 agreements have the potential for a significant positive effect through the provision of a range of community facilities and infrastructure improvements to sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | As above. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy CS19 - Accessible buildings | All new development should be designed to ensure that buildings and land within their curtilage are fully accessible to groups with special mobility requirements. 100% of new residential units should be built to the Lifetime Homes Standards highlighted in the Council's Planning and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. The proportion of wheelchair accessible homes on new residential redevelopments of 15 or more units will be considered on a site by site basis, having regard to current needs in the Borough. |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | This policy should help to support improved accessibility to housing for the mobility impaired. The effects are likely to be minor and permanent and not significant. | + | + | + | None required. | This policy should refer to dial a ride mobility provision to improve accessibility from the home to essential services and facilities for the mobility impaired. The scale and significance of effects and the confirmation of such effects will be confirmed through the Planning and Design Guide SPD. Cross reference to Policy CS6 - Housing Mix. Recommend deleting this policy and including the essence of this policy to provide accessible buildings in CS6. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy includes a mechanism to provide homes to meet the needs of those with mobility difficulties. In addition, this policy should significantly increase the ability of the housing stock to meet the design and quality criteria of the lifetime homes standard, which should have permanent and significant positive effects in ensuring all homes, are fully accessible and thus inclusive. In the medium and long term, positive effects are likely to be greater as developers adapt to meeting the lifetime home standards. | + | ++ | ++ | None required. | To monitor through the development control process the extent to which new residential units meet the lifetime homes standard and the actual percentage realised. As above. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | This policy should help to ensure that an increased amount of homes meet the needs of certain disadvantaged groups | + | ++ | ++ | None required. | As above. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | such as the mobility impaired. This is likely to have some positive effects in terms of increasing equality of opportunity and reducing social exclusion. In the medium and long term, positive effects are likely to be greater as developers adapt to meeting the lifetime home standards. | | | | | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|---------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Table E6: Transport and Parking Policies

| | |
|--|---|
| Transport and Parking (combined policies) | CS Policy 20: Development and Accessibility Policy CS21: Accessibility and Parking CS22: Promoting Alternatives to the car |
|--|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | The creation of accessibility zones and the focus of major trip generating commercial development in areas of high public transport accessibility is likely to have permanent positive effects. Effects are likely to be in the medium and long term although not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as positive. | A key diagram outlining the location of the accessibility zones was unavailable available at the time of assessment. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | Focusing development in the most accessible locations across the District should help to improve opportunities for social engagement and promote a more equitable pattern of development and investment resulting in permanent positive effects. | + | + | + | Not required as positive. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | This policy seeks to promote alternatives to the car at the same time through providing car parking standards, the continued reliance of the car in the District. This policy supports a range of measures to providing alternatives to the car which is likely to have indirect positive effects in improving health through the promotion of walking and cycling as alternatives to the car. The extent of these positive effects is uncertain as they rely on the successful implementation of such | + | + | + | Not required as positive. | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|--|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | measures and as such, the certainty of effects will depend on external influences. | | | | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Reducing reliance on the private car and improving non motorised networks and facilities is unlikely to have an effect on contamination and soil |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | With reference to travel plans, location of development, parking and promoting alternative to the car there should be strong positive effects on reducing dependence on the private car. These positive effects are likely to be permanent and could be significant depending on implementation. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | Potential significant effects if there is a modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport which will depend on the extent and nature of proposals proposed. The extent of the positive effects will be dependant the measures outlined in the review of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan and as such, any effects are not certain. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | As part of work travel plans some company's may wish to provide shower facilities to encourage staff to cycle. Reference should be made to BREEAM standards to ensure water use is minimal |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Reduction in private car use will have a positive effect on improving air quality. These positive effects are likely to be permanent and not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | The extent of the positive effects will be dependant the measures outlined in the review of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan and as such, any effects are not certain. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Reduction in private car use will have a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These positive effects are likely to be permanent and not significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | The extent of the positive effects will be dependant the measures outlined in the review of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan and as such, any effects are not certain. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The promotion of alternatives to the car is likely to have an indirect positive effect on the viability and vitality of town centres by making town centres more accessible to a wider cross-section of the population. Effects are likely to be long term, although non-significant. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Table E7: Town Centre Retail Policies

| | |
|---|---|
| Town Centre Policies (combined assessment under 'Town Centres and Shopping'. | CS Policy 23 – Town Centre Strategy CS Policy 24 – Strengthening Town Centres CS Policy 25 – Retail and commercial development in Shenley CS Policy 26 – Safe and attractive evening economy |
|---|---|

Town Centres and Shopping

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | The town centre policies in the draft CS provide a balanced town centre strategy allowing appropriate size and scale retail and commercial units in the main towns, districts and neighbourhood centres of Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey and Radlett. As such, a balanced town centre strategy will ensure ready access to facilities and services is provided. The focus for larger scale development and night time economy in the main centres of Borehamwood and Potter Bar and allowing development in Shenley Retail Park should help to concentrate facilities and services in the most accessible locations. However, there the health check study undertaken shows that there is unlikely to be a need for significant new retail space, the scale of positive effects are unlikely to be significant. | + | + | + | None required. | The town centre policies should be amended to ensure that new development permitted is supported by sustainable transport infrastructure or cross refer to Core Strategy Policies 20 and 21. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | The town centre policy in providing a safe and attractive environment and in not | + | + | + | None required. | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | permitting further consents in areas where concentrations of drinking establishments and night-clubs cause existing problems should contribute to reducing crime and fear of crime. The likelihood of these positive effects is uncertain as policy will not change social behaviour and the duration of the positive effects is unknown. | | | | | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effect. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | By focussing retail development within the designated town, district or neighbourhood centres retail development will be directed away from Greenfield sites and is likely to have a significant positive effect on this objective. The effect is likely to be long term and permanent. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Maintaining the strength and vitality of the town centres as well as encouraging an evening economy should ensure that people do not have to travel far for retail and leisure. There is potential for this to reduce the dependence on private car use and as such, is likely to have permanent positive but not significant effect. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive | Providing an attractive town centre which can be used in the day and evening will reduce the need for people to travel elsewhere for retail and leisure needs. This can be enhanced by providing good night bus services to deter reliance on cars in the evening. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|-----------------|--|--|----|----|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Provision of good retail and leisure facilities should reduce the need to travel to other settlements for these services which should have a permanent positive effect on improving air quality. | + | + | + | None required. | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Provision of good retail and leisure facilities should reduce the need to travel to other settlements for these services which should have permanent positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transport. | + | + | + | None required. | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The identification of primary and secondary shopping frontages will have a significant positive effect on supporting the wider role of town centres and contributing towards a balanced and stable economy. The effect is likely to be long term and significant. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The policy seeks to strongly support the development of diverse town centres with strong retail cores enveloped in a broader range of uses in secondary frontages. This is the model recognised as delivering vital and viable town centres in the most effective manner. The ability to control the location of (A4) pubs and bars and (A5) take away uses will enable better control of the night time economy, with a secondary effect on enhancing the viability and vitality of town centres. The effect is likely to be long term and significant. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |

APPENDIX F

Assessment of Additional Preferred Policies

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Policy SP1 Creating Sustainable Development</p> | <p>The use and development of all land will be assessed against the need to protect and enhance the natural and built environment, including the diverse character and local distinctiveness of the Borough. Development should take place within the environmental capacity of its locality and in proportion to its location within the hierarchy of settlements in the Borough. Development will be required to maximise the conservation of land, energy and resources and should be designed to a high standard, taking advantage of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area.</p> <p>This is to be achieved through the careful management of the natural and built environment, close liaison with the Environment Agency and Natural England and the implementation of policies which reflect the principles of sustainable development. These policies will require development to be well located and focused on previously developed land wherever possible, reflecting the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy. Policies will be required which cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Protection and enhancement of natural and historic assets (Policy CS11) ◆ Environmental Impact of Development (Policy CS13) ◆ Efficient Use of Natural Resources (Policy CS14) ◆ The location and supply of new homes (Policy CS1) ◆ Scale and Distribution of Employment Land (Policy CS7) ◆ Development and Accessibility (Policy CS20) ◆ Together with more detailed design and amenity policies in the Site Allocations and Development Control Policies DPDs |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | fear of crime and anti social behaviour | | | | | | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | Making efficient use of land should have a slight positive long term effect on maximising the conservation of land | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Protecting and enhancing the natural environment should have a moderate long term positive effect on reducing contamination and safeguarding soil quality | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | Protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment should have a strong long term positive effect. | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of countryside and landscape | See assessment for objective 9 | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | The emphasis on protecting the natural environment and maximising energy use in the policy should have a slight positive long term effect. | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | See assessment for objective 9 | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | See assessment for objective 9 | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | As developments will be required to maximise the conservation of resource, this should have a moderate long term positive effect | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of climate change | See assessment for objective 9 | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | See assessment for objective 9 | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as positive | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | The requirement for developments to maximise the conservation of energy | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | should have a slight positive long term effect | | | | | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | See assessment of objective 17 | +++ | +++ | +++ | Not required as positive | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | The requirement for developments to maximise the conservation of energy and resources should have a slight positive long term effect | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | Protection of the natural environment and requirements to maximise the conservation of energy and resources should have a slight positive long term effect. | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The overall aim of the policy should have a slight positive long term effect | + | + | + | Not required as positive | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policy SP2 – Meeting local housing needs | <p>The Council will support new house building schemes on sites in sustainable locations, with a focus on development within the three Strategic Housing Locations of Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey.</p> <p>Unless there are exceptional circumstances, no more than 40% of new housing will be sought in Borehamwood, up to 30% in Potters Bar, up to 30% in Bushey and up to 15% in Radlett and other suitable locations.</p> <p>Development proposals should ensure that any adverse effects on the built and natural environment are avoided and / or mitigated. Windfall developments will be supported on appropriate sites in all towns, subject to the environmental constraints and requirements of Policies SP1, CS 12, 14, 15 and other relevant planning policies. The provision of adaptable and affordably priced homes for the local community will be sought in all locations and suitable proposals from social rented landlords will be supported, where required, on qualifying development sites.</p> |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No effect | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | By directing the majority of housing development to key settlements, linked to appropriate capacity thresholds, new provision should be well related to services and facilities by a variety of modes. | ++ | ++ | +++ | None required as positive. | There will be a need to ensure that new housing development is well served by public transport, walking and cycling provision to maximise accessibility. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | The policy provides a spatial distribution strategy to meet the identified housing growth target. In addition, the requirement to provide adaptable and affordable housing in suitable locations is complementary to the objective. | ++ | +++ | +++ | None required as positive. | There will be a need to ensure that the thresholds of ‘qualifying development sites’ are such that the provision of affordable/special needs housing is not jeopardised in order for the positive effects to be realised. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | By locating new residential development in accessible locations, well related to existing service centres, the policy should help to support increased social engagement and improve accessibility to jobs and services for a wider cross-section of the population. | + | ++ | ++ | Ensure that new housing development is accompanied by additional community facilities and services where appropriate. | Effects are likely to become increasingly beneficial over time as more housing developments are realised and social networks become more established. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social | The policy seeks to ensure that new housing development includes an elements | + | + | + | Ensure that new residential development reflects best | The effects of the policy on the objective are limited by the fact that much is dependent on factors |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|------|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | behaviour | of affordable and special needs housing, as well as a range of tenure where appropriate – mixing of communities should help to reduce the risk of anti-social behaviour often associated with ‘estate’ type development. | | | | practice principles of designing out crime, both in buildings and the public realm. | outside the control of environmental change alone. |
| 6 | To improve population’s health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The policy supports development in accordance with the sustainable development principles of policy SP1, which requires brownfield development in advance of greenfield. The approach to windfall development is also complementary to this approach. | + | ++ | +/- | Building re-use should be encouraged as a means of reducing the requirement for new build housing provision. | Over the longer term, it is likely that in order to realise housing provision targets, some release of greenfield sites may be required. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | Linked to the above, in order to realise brownfield development in advance of greenfield, remediation of contaminated land is supported by the policy. However, new build development will inevitably result in the loss/disturbance of soils in some locations. | +/- | +/- | +/- | New development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, in accordance with the EcoHomes criteria. | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | By directing residential development to key settlements based on thresholds of provision, the policy should help to minimise the impact of new building to an appropriate level in order to safeguard the character of established centres. There is, however, a risk that increased growth of settlement may have negative effects on historic building etc. through increased building and transport emissions. | ++ | ++ | ++/- | New development should be designed to respect and respond to local vernacular. The form and layout of new residential development should reflect the existing character of settlements. New residential expansion should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling provision linked to key services, facilities and employment. | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | The policy approach of directing new residential development to existing settlements should help to minimise | ++ | ++ | ++/- | Where development is likely to have a visual impact on the landscape, mitigation through | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|------|------|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | expansion into greenfield sites. However, there is a risk that the cumulative effects in the longer term will result in an increase in the visual intrusion of built development on the landscape and alter the form of historic settlements. | | | | planting and careful use of topographical features should seek to lessen any intrusion. | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | The policy approach of directing the majority of new residential development to existing key centres should help to reduce the need to travel, as well as provide new residents with a choice of non-road based transport modes, which will be complementary to the objective. | ++ | ++ | +++ | There will be a need to ensure that sustainable transport infrastructure is in place in advance of the occupation of new development. | The effectiveness of the policy will depend on ensuring that non-road modes provide realistic and attractive alternatives to the private car – this will depend on some factors outside the control of land use planning. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | In setting out the spatial approach to the delivery of new residential development, the policy seeks to direct development to existing settlements, preferring brownfield over greenfield development. This should help to avoid the impact on open countryside and designated sites, however, there may be increased disturbance to some urban biodiversity networks and indeed loss of biodiversity interest on some brownfield sites. Increased transport movements may also have adverse effects on biodiversity. | ++ | ++/- | ++/- | <p>New residential development should incorporate habitat replacement/development as appropriate.</p> <p>Green space (public realm and gardens) should be designed to encourage use as wildlife corridors incorporating a variety of species types.</p> <p>Walking, cycling and recreational space should avoid sensitive locations to minimise human disturbance.</p> | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | In increasing the amount of built development across the plan area, the policy presents an increased risk of pollutants entering the ground water system through increased and accelerated run off. | - | -- | -- | <p>Infrastructure associated with residential development should include run off filtration systems where appropriate.</p> <p>New residential development should incorporate SuDS where practicable.</p> <p>New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the water system.</p> | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------|------|------|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | In increasing the amount of residential development across the plan area, the policy will inevitably increase water consumption. | -- | -- | --- | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>SuDS should be supported in new development wherever possible.</p> <p>Greywater recycling should be incorporated into residential development as standard.</p> | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | In increasing the amount of built development across the plan area, the risk of flooding through accelerating run-off may be increased. However, the spatial distribution of development seeks to avoid locations of known flood risk, or those sites most likely to result in a breaching of thresholds for flooding. | +/- | +/- | +/- | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>SuDS should be supported in new development wherever possible.</p> <p>Greywater recycling should be incorporated into residential development as standard.</p> | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | In focusing new residential development in and around existing key centres, there is an increased risk of localised air quality issues associated both with built development and an increase in transport movements. This may be offset to some degree by the application of thresholds to the scale of development in each centre and conformity to Policy SP1, which seeks a reduction in energy use. | -/+ | --/+ | --/+ | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the atmosphere.</p> | Negative effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as more development is realised across the plan area. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | The policy sets out the spatial strategy for the delivery of an increased amount of residential development across the plan area, which will result in an increase in GHG emissions, both from buildings and increased transport movements. | -- | --- | --- | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling</p> | Negative effects will be more pronounced over time as the cumulative effects of increased development are realised. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|----|------|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the atmosphere. | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | An increase in the residential development across the plan area will increase energy requirements, although there may be opportunities to incorporate renewable energy generation in some schemes, which is supported by conformity of SP2 to SP1. | - | -- | --/+ | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the atmosphere.</p> <p>Renewable energy technologies should be promoted for use in schemes where practicable.</p> | Some benefits are likely in the longer term as the combination of increased residential development and more advanced technologies make the prospect of domestic renewable energy use more readily available. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | An increase in residential development across the plan area will increase domestic waste generation. However, opportunities will exist for the development of sustainable waste management for new provision. | - | -- | --/+ | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>Sustainable waste management should be promoted for use in schemes where practicable.</p> | Some benefits are likely in the longer term as waste management and processing techniques become more advanced and widespread. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | In directing new residential development to existing centres through a combination of expansion and infill development, the policy should help to increase the catchment of key town centres, improve accessibility and support increased vitality, which in turn supports viability of town centre businesses and services. | ++ | ++ | +++ | None required as positive. | Effects are likely to be increasingly beneficial over time as additional population is attracted to key centres and the range of services that can be supported is increased. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Policy SP6 – securing high quality design | The Council will require all development to be of high quality design which is appropriate in scale to the local context and ensures the creation of attractive, usable, safe and accessible places. Development proposals will be expected to take advantage of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area. The Council will also take account of the cumulative impact of new development on the character and appearance of an area including the impact arising from residential intensification and redevelopment within residential areas. |
|--|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | Insofar as the policy requires a high quality of design in all new development, the quality of new housing should represent an improvement on some of the existing stock. | + | + | + | | The effects are minor since the policy affects only one element of the objective. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | The promotion of high quality design in all development should contribute to the creation of an environment that is more conducive to social interaction, as well as better connected in terms of the public realm. | + | + | + | | The effects are minor since the policy can only hope to effect change in the physical environment, yet the objective encompasses broader social aims. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | In promoting the creation of safe and useable spaces, the policy should make a contribution to the objective. | + | + | ++ | | The effects are moderate since the objective relates to a number of issues that are beyond the scope of physical changes alone. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The policy seeks to secure high quality in the design of all new development, which should include maximising the development potential of sites. | + | ++ | ++ | | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | In seeking the delivery of high quality design in all development, the policy makes specific reference to the need for design to enhance local character and respond to local context, both of which are highly complementary to the objective. | ++ | +++ | +++ | None required as effects are positive. | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | The delivery of high quality design in all development should necessarily result in maintenance and, in some cases, enhancement of the quality of the countryside and landscape. | ++ | +++ | +++ | None required as effects are positive. | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the | In encouraging a high quality of design in | + | ++ | +++ | None required as positive. | The design of spaces and places is a key |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | viability and vitality of town centres | new development, including the design of the public realm, the policy presents the opportunity to ensure that town centres are redeveloped to high standards, which is likely to have benefits over time. | | | | | determining factor in encouraging increased length of stay, which in turn is a key measure of the vitality of towns. Towns must be vital to enable businesses to remain viable, thus the two are strongly linked. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy CS1 – The location and supply of new homes | <p>The Council will make provision for 5,000 new homes (at an average annual housebuilding rate of 250 homes) should this represent the housing requirement in the finalised East of England Plan for the period 2001 – 2021. In providing for a target of 5,000 homes and identifying new locations for development, the Council will take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) environmental constraints and compliance with the key environmental policies set out in the Core Strategy (including Policies CS11, CS12 and CS14); ii) the density of the surrounding area; iii) the need to retain existing housing; iv) the need to locate new development in the most accessible locations; v) the settlement hierarchy identified in the Hertsmere Core Strategy; and vi) the need to focus development within the boundaries of existing built-up areas. |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|-----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | The site identification criteria set out in the policy include a need to locate new development in the most accessible locations and focus on existing built-up areas, which are likely to contain established services and facilities. This should help to increase viability of the provision of public transport services as well as rendering walking and cycling a more realistic option for shorter trips, all of which will contribute to increased accessibility. | + | ++ | +++ | There will be a need to ensure that all new residential development is well served by non-road transport infrastructure in advance of occupation. | The strategy of co-locating housing with existing settlements will only be successful against the objective if new development is fully networked by a range of transportation options. Increased benefits over time as a result of increased completion rates and thus a greater proportion of prospective resident enjoying improved accessibility. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | The policy sets out the commitment of the council to meeting the construction target based on the housing needs assessment for the region. . | + | ++ | ++ | There will be a need to ensure that the housing developed includes provision for affordable and special needs units, as well as a variety of sizes and types of units. | Matters relating to the type and tenure of housing (which is part of the objective) are addressed in other plan policies, thus the significance of benefits has been reduced. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | The policy only seeks to set out the general approach to providing a set number of units. There is insufficient detail to assess whether this will result in positive or adverse effects against the objective. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | In including environmental constraints and a presumption in favour of locating development of housing in the most accessible locations, the policy may help to deliver brownfield sites in favour of greenfield, although this is not overly explicit. | ? | ? | ? | | There is a need for additional information relating to the phasing of brownfield and greenfield sites for housing. Density information also needs to be clarified in order for an assessment to be made with any certainty. |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | The development of sites to accommodate 5000 houses over the plan period will inevitably require considerable land take. Although environmental constraints are likely to push some provision onto brownfield sites in need of remediation, the assessment criteria do not preclude the development of greenfield land. | +/- | +/- | +/- | Development should be directed to brownfield land in preference to greenfield sites. Materials for new development should seek to maximise use of renewable resources. | Negative effects are likely to increase over time as more sites are brought forward for development and pressure for land increases. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | The consideration of historic assets and the impact of development upon them are included within the site assessment criteria, as is the need to respect existing development densities. Over the longer term, however, the development pressure to meet the 5,000 target is likely to result in some negative effects. | +++ | ++ | +/- | The design of new development should respect and respond to the local vernacular. | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | The consideration of environmental constraints is included within the site assessment criteria, together with compliance with policies that seek to protect biodiversity and landscape features from adverse effects of development. Over the | +++ | ++ | +/- | Loss of green belt land to development will need to be mitigated by a combination of landscaping and planting. Where habitats are lost to new | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|------|-----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | longer term, however, the cumulative effects of residential growth and likely to have negative effects. | | | | development, the appropriate mitigation planting should be sought. The policy should include a phasing clause to ensure that green belt sites are only released for development once all available brownfield sites have been developed. | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | The site assessment criteria include the need to site development in the most accessible locations, and focus provision of housing within existing built up areas. This should increase the viability and practicality of public transport services as well as providing opportunities to reduce the need to travel and increase linked trips, all of which may contribute to an encouragement to adopt more sustainable transport practices. | ++ | ++ | +++ | There will be a need to ensure that development is well served by non-car based transportation provision in advance of occupation. | The effectiveness of the policy against the objective will be dependent on some elements that are beyond the scope of planning interventions. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | Compliance with environmental protection policies is one of the site assessment criteria. In the short term this should provide conformity with the objective; however, longer term, development pressure is likely to result in negative effects arising from some severance and disturbance, particularly of wildlife corridors. | ++ | ++/- | +/- | Loss of land of biodiversity interest to development will need to be mitigated by a combination of landscaping and planting. Where habitats are lost to new development, the appropriate mitigation planting should be sought. | Increasingly over time it is likely that development pressure will result in disturbance to habitats and biodiversity interest. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | Consideration of the impact of development on surface and ground water is included in the environmental constraints that form part of the site assessment criteria. However, increasingly over time, the realisation of 5000 new units will present an increased risk of pollution from buildings and transport movements. | ++ | ++/- | +/- | Infrastructure associated with residential development should include run off filtration systems where appropriate. New residential development should incorporate SuDS where practicable. New residential development should be well served by public | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------|------|------|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the water system. | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | The development of an additional 5000 dwellings over the plan period will evidently increase water consumption. Opportunities will exist to ensure that water conservation is incorporated into design. | -- | -- | --/+ | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>SuDS should be supported in new development wherever possible.</p> <p>Greywater recycling should be incorporated into residential development as standard.</p> | Effects are likely to become increasingly beneficial over time as new and improved technologies enable water conservation to become more widely available across the plan area. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | Flooding and the risk of flooding are incorporated in the environmental constraints that form part of the site assessment criteria. There may be an increased risk of flooding over time, however, as development sites near completion and permeable surfaces and increasingly replaced with impermeable development. | ++ | ++/- | +/- | <p>SuDS should be supported in new development wherever practicable.</p> <p>Permeable surfacing should be incorporated into development where appropriate (e.g. hardstanding)</p> | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Increased residential development will result in increased emissions from buildings and transportation. This is likely to have significant adverse effects on local air quality in a number of locations, particularly given the policy approach of focusing development on the existing built up areas. | -- | --- | --- | <p>New development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks in advance of occupation.</p> <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria.</p> | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | An increase of 5000 residential units over the plan period will result in a significant increase in net GHG emissions both from domestic units and associated transport movement. | -- | --- | --- | <p>New development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks in advance of occupation.</p> <p>New residential development should be designed to the</p> | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|------|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria. | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | An increase in residential development of 5000 units will significantly increase the need for energy across the plan area and increasingly over time. However, in the longer term this may be offset to some degree by more widespread use of energy saving techniques and renewable energy technologies. | --- | -- | --/+ | New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria. Opportunities for renewable energy technologies should be supported wherever possible. | Adverse effects may decrease over the longer term as renewable energy technologies become more advanced and more readily available. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | The development of an additional 5000 residential units will result in a significant increase in domestic waste generation. In the longer term, this may be offset to some degree by improvements in waste transfer and recovery technologies, coupled with increased recycling and composting. | -- | --- | --/+ | Policies should pro-actively support the development of sustainable waste management through physical provision. New development should specify materials from sustainable sources. | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | In focusing additional housing provision on existing centres, the policy approach is likely to benefit town centres as new residents will provide additional critical mass to support existing and new commercial development, including the evening economy, which is an important element of vitality and viability. | ++ | ++ | +++ | None as effects are positive. | Effects are likely to be increasingly beneficial in the longer term as the population expands. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Policy CS2 – housing beyond existing built up areas</p> | <p>New Policy CS2: Housing beyond existing built up areas:</p> <p>Changes to Green Belt boundaries to accommodate up to 550 new homes at an overall density of 40 dwellings per hectare will be focused on sites to be identified through the Site Allocations DPD within any of the following preferred areas, as illustrated on the Key Diagram:</p> <p>Borehamwood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land to the west of Cowley Hill and Rowley Lane ▪ Land to the north of Barnet Lane between Furzehill Road and Hartfield Avenue <p>Potters Bar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land between Dugdale Hill Lane and Barnet Road ▪ Land at Potters Bar Golf Club ▪ Land to the north and south of Mutton Lane ▪ Land between Southgate Road and the Borough boundary, south of Conningsby Drive <p>The identification of individual sites will be based on a range of criteria including (but not restricted to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Air quality; ii) Noise; iii) Transport impact; iv) Flood risk; v) Nature conservation value; vi) Landscape conservation value v) Agricultural land quality; and vi) Accessibility to public transport and essential services |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities | Extension of the urban areas into green belt to accommodate additional housing requirements | ? | - | -- | There will be a need to ensure that all new development is well | Uncertainty in the short term due to lack of clarity on phasing of site release. Increasingly over the longer |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|--------------------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | for all residents | will require additional infrastructure to ensure accessibility to essential services and facilities. There may, therefore, be some negative effects. | | | | linked to services and facilities by non-road modes of transport. | term, as more green belt sites are developed, negative effects are likely although the scale will be limited by the relatively small proportion of prospective residents that will be affected by the policy (restricted to the occupants of 550 homes max.) |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | Expansion of site identification into the green belt in some locations has been incorporated in order to ensure that the housing targets can be met. A density target of 40 dph should help to maintain a comfortable residential environment, incorporating some open space. | + | ++ | ++ | New housing development, irrespective of location, should incorporate a range of types and tenure to encourage the development of mixed communities. | Increased benefits over time as more housing is constructed to meet needs. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | The development of housing in former green belt areas may have some negative effects since it will increase travelling distances for prospective resident to access key service settlements and may reduce transport choices. | - | - | -- | All new development should be well served by non-road transport infrastructure in advance of occupation. | The scale of effects will be limited by the relatively small proportion of prospective residents that will be affected by the policy (restricted to the occupants of 550 homes max.) |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | Encroachment of built development into the green belt may, albeit to a limited extent, reduce accessibility to open space and recreational land for some residents, as well as having a negative effect on the carbon sink, which is important in maintaining air quality (and thus respiratory health). | - | - | -- | New development should be designed to incorporate green space and access to recreational land. Where habitats are lost to new development, the appropriate mitigation planting should be sought. | Effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as land is developed. |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | The allocation of green belt sites for housing development at the outset of the plan period is contrary to the aims of the objective. | --- | --- | --- | The policy should include a phasing clause to ensure that green belt sites are only released for development once all available brownfield sites have been developed. | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | The re-allocation of green belt land for housing will result in the permanent loss of soils and a reduction in soil quantity at the local level. | ? | - | -- | | Uncertainty in the short term due to lack of clarity relating to the phased release of land for development. Increasingly negative effects in the longer terms as sites are developed. Scale of effect not significant on the basis that the land take should be limited to c. 14ha. on the basis of 40 dph. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------|-----|------|--|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | Loss of green belt to development will have some effects on the landscape character of the affected sites. | - | -- | -- | Loss of green belt land to development will need to be mitigated by a combination of landscaping and planting. Impact on the historic character of the locale should form one of the assessment criteria for site identification. | Scale of effect not significant on the basis that the land take should be limited to c. 14ha. on the basis of 40 dph. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | The re-allocation of green belt land for housing will be contrary to the objective as it will result in loss of countryside. | -- | --- | --- | Loss of green belt land to development will need to be mitigated by a combination of landscaping and planting. Where habitats are lost to new development, the appropriate mitigation planting should be sought. The policy should include a phasing clause to ensure that green belt sites are only released for development once all available brownfield sites have been developed. | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Residential development on green belt land is likely to increase the need to travel in order to access established facilities and services. | +/- | +/- | ++/- | All new development should be well-served by non-road modes in advance of occupation. | In the longer term it is likely that improved infrastructure will increase transport choices to a wider section of the population, thus there may be an increase in modal shift over time. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | The re-allocation of green belt land for housing is likely to result in the loss of sites of local biodiversity interest. | - | -- | --- | Loss of green belt land to development will need to be mitigated by a combination of landscaping and planting. Where habitats are lost to new development, the appropriate mitigation planting should be sought. The policy should include a phasing clause to ensure that | The threat of negative effects increases over time as development pressure increases.. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|--|--------------------|----|-----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | green belt sites are only released for development once all available brownfield sites have been developed. | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | The introduction of built development onto undeveloped land will inevitably increase the risk of surface and ground water pollution both during and post-construction. | - | -- | -- | Infrastructure associated with residential development should include run off filtration systems where appropriate. New residential development should incorporate SuDS where practicable. New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the water system. | Effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as development nears completion. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | The introduction of an additional 550 homes into undeveloped land will inevitably result in an increase in water consumption. | - | -- | -- | New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including the EcoHomes criteria. SuDS should be supported in new development wherever possible. Greywater recycling should be incorporated into residential development as standard. | Effects are likely to be more pronounced over time as development nears completion. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | Flood risk forms one of the criteria for site selection thus there should be no notable effects beyond an increase in run off. | ? | - | - | SuDS should be supported in new development wherever practicable. | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | The introduction of built development and transport movements into previously undeveloped sites will have negative effects on local air quality. | -- | -- | --- | New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria. New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|-----|---|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | | | | | networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the atmosphere. | |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | 550 new homes and associated transport movements will result in a net increase in GHG emissions. | - | -- | -- | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the atmosphere.</p> | |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | 550 new homes will increase overall energy requirements. By dividing provision across a range of sites, the potential for capitalising on renewable energy technologies is limited to domestic scale equipment. | -- | -- | -/+ | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>New residential development should be well served by public transport, walking and cycling networks to minimise the impact of transport based pollutants entering the atmosphere.</p> <p>Renewable energy technologies should be promoted for use in schemes where practicable.</p> | Some benefits are likely in the longer term as the combination of increased residential development and more advanced technologies make the prospect of domestic renewable energy use more readily available. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | An increase in residential development will result in an increase in domestic waste generation. | - | -- | -- | <p>New residential development should be designed to the highest environmental standards, including EcoHomes criteria.</p> <p>Sustainable waste management should be promoted for use in schemes where practicable.</p> | Some benefits are likely in the longer term as waste management and processing techniques become more advanced and widespread. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the | No obvious effects | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| viability and vitality of town centres | | | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Policy CS3 – Phasing of Housing Development</p> | <p>To facilitate a sustainable rate of house building within the Borough under the terms of Policies CS1 and CS2, the Council will permit the following levels of new housing development, measured from the start of the plan period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1: Up to 2,740 new homes by March 2011 (equivalent to 330 homes per year between April 2006 and March 2011) Phase 2: Up to 3,690 new homes by March 2016 (equivalent to 190 homes per year between April 2011 and March 2016) Phase 3: Up to 5,000 new homes by March 2021 (equivalent to 262 homes per year between April 2016 and March 2021) <p>Housing sites will be phased on this basis in the Site Allocations DPD to facilitate the required levels of house building sought in the East of England Plan. Based on the findings of Annual Monitoring Reports, allocated land in later phases will be brought forward, if necessary, to maintain the five year supply of land for housing.</p> <p>Additional Greenfield sites should be identified in the Site Allocations DPD to enable the provision of a further 100 homes in Phase 2 and 465 homes in Phase 3, within the overall housing totals sought within those phases.</p> <p>In order to prevent the overdevelopment of housing in the Borough ahead of required infrastructure and community facilities, outstanding residential land allocations and residential proposals of 25 units (net) or more will not be permitted where the number of projected completions, as detailed in Annual Monitoring Report housing trajectory, is forecast to exceed either</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the annualised phasing sought under the terms of this policy by 20% in the forthcoming three years a final target of 5,000 homes in the East of England Plan before 2021 |
|---|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | None required. | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | A phased programme for housing in Hertsmere is likely to ensure the delivery of sustainable communities across Hertsmere ensuring that infrastructure is in place to reduce the burden on existing infrastructure and community facilities which is likely to occur with new housing development. The positive effects are likely to be permanent and occur in the short, | ++ | ++ | ++ | None required. | The availability of supporting infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity in some locations will determine the timing of the release of housing sites. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | medium and long term through the managed release of housing during the plan period. | | | | | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | A phased programme for housing delivery in Hertsmere is likely to meet the short and medium term requirements for housing in the borough through existing local plan allocations and identified sites in the urban capacity study. In the short and medium term the effects are likely to be positive and permanent. In the longer term, if regional housing targets are exceeded, the Council will restrict the amount of new housing and as such, may result in negative effects for future housing needs. | ++ | ++ | - | This objective will be monitored through the AMR. | The availability of supporting infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity in some locations will determine the timing of the release of housing sites. The Council will monitor housing trajectory on an annual basis through its Annual Monitoring Report and will provide up to date information to inform the five year housing supply in Hertsmere. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | A managed release of housing should enable housing allocation sites to take account of areas of deprivation and use housing development as a catalyst for promoting equality of opportunities for housing. The availability of supporting infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity for community facilities prior to the release of housing may also combat poverty and social exclusion. In the short and medium term the effects are likely to be positive and permanent. However, if regional housing targets are exceeded, the Council will restrict the amount of new housing and as such, may result in negative effects on deprivation in the longer term. | ++ | ++ | - | This objective will be monitored through the AMR. | The Site Allocations DPD will identify the housing sites and as such, will confirm the scale and significance of the positive effects which will depend on the extent to which allocated sites are included in areas of deprivation. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Designing out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. | Designing out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | Provision of housing on Greenfield sites may reduce the populations' ability to access open space for physical activity. This could have a slight long term negative effect on health. | - | - | - | Where Greenfield is developed, land elsewhere should be identified for replacement of the lost open space or current local open space facilities should be improved as part of developer contributions. | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. Positive effects are likely in the short to term, however there is potential for a negative effect in the medium to long term. The potential for a negative effect is related to the provision of housing on Greenfield sites in phase 2 and phase 3. | + | - | - | Where the use of Greenfield sites are identified as essential, building density should be high in order to limit land take as much as possible. | This policy is closely linked to Core Policy CS1 in terms of providing new housing development during the plan period but refers to the phasing of the housing. |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | The use of Greenfield sites could cause loss and degradation of soil in the medium to long term. | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | The use of Greenfield sites could have a medium to long term negative effect on landscape character. | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | As above | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | The use of Greenfield sites may cause houses to be further away from the main services and infrastructure which may increase the need to travel by private car for sections of the community. This will have a medium to long term negative effect. | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | The use of Greenfield sites may encroach on or effect important habitats and species, with a medium to long term slight negative effect. | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. | - | - | -- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | See assessment of SA Objective 11. | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | See assessment of SA Objective 11. | + | - | - | As above | As above. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes'. | - | - | -- | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | See assessment of Core Policy CS1 'Location and Supply of New Homes' | - | + | + | See assessment of Core Policy CS1. | As above. |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The policy is likely to have slight positive effect by ensuring a sustainable rate of house building over the plan period enabling stability in the local construction industry. Additionally, phasing | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|---|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | of development will allow for adequate supporting infrastructure to be planned and provided for contributing towards a balanced and stable economy. | | | | | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Policy CS4 – Affordable Housing</p> | <p>In order to optimise the supply of Affordable Housing, developments involving more than 15 residential units, or residential sites of more than 0.5 hectares, in Borehamwood, Bushey, Potters Bar, Radlett and other accessible locations, should make provision for an element of affordable housing.</p> <p>The Council will continue to seek the provision of at least 25% on qualifying sites, pending the finalisation of Affordable Housing requirements in the East of England Plan, equating to an overall Affordable Housing target of 840 homes (out of an overall housing target of 5,000 homes).</p> <p>On sites requiring the provision of affordable housing and subject to other relevant DPD / Local Plan policies, the Council will seek to maximise the provision of affordable, rented accommodation with at least 75% of Affordable Homes to be provided in the form of social rented housing, managed through a Registered Social Landlord.</p> |
|---|---|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy would provide affordable housing at a lower level than is advised in the Housing Needs Survey. This identifies a shortfall of 351 affordable houses a year. During the maximum phase of house building, only 83 affordable houses may be built under this new level. This will have a | -- | -- | -- | | Monitoring of affordable housing units through the development control process and the AMR. |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|----------------------|---|---|----|----|---------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| | long term significant negative effect. | | | | | | |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | This policy is not in line with the Housing Needs Survey in relation to the number of affordable houses provided however it will still provide a 75%/25% split between social rented and intermediate housing which has also been identified through the Housing Needs Study. The effects are likely to be negative, long term and significant. | -- | -- | -- | | As objective 3. |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | Design out crime should be encouraged in new housing developments. | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|--|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | As affordable housing needs will not be met some sections of the community may still have a need to travel between housing and employment sites, so having a long term negative effect on air quality | - | - | - | Provision of an improved public transport system may reduce the need for sections of the community who need to travel between housing and employment sites to rely on private car use. | Sections of the community such as key workers or others with low income may have reduced reliance on cars if availability of affordable housing means their housing and employment needs are met in the same area |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | As affordable housing needs will not be met some sections of the community may still have a need to travel between housing and employment sites, so having a long term negative effect on greenhouse gas emissions. | - | - | - | Provision of an improved public transport system may reduce the need for sections of the community who need to travel between housing and employment sites to rely on private car use. | Sections of the community such as key workers or others with low income may have reduced reliance on cars if availability of affordable housing means their housing and employment needs are met in the same area |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The policy will not provide sufficient levels of affordable homes, particularly for key workers; therefore the economy may not become balanced and fully prosperous. The effect is likely to be negative and long term. | ++ | ++ | ++ | | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Policy CS8 – Scale and Distribution of Employment Land</p> | <p>In order to encourage economic development and promote a competitive local economy, provision will be made for the supply of at least 102ha of designated employment land for B-class development within the Borough up to 2021, focused on the following locations and as identified on the Key Diagram:</p> <p><u>Employment Areas</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elstree Way, Borehamwood ▪ Stirling Way, Borehamwood ▪ Cranborne Road, Potters Bar ▪ Station Close, Potters Bar ▪ Otterspool Way, Bushey <p><u>Key Employment Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Centennial Park, Elstree <p>The boundaries of these locations will be clarified in the Site Allocations DPD including the limited release of up to 4 hectares of previously designated land within the Elstree Way Employment Area for new housing or housing-led mixed-use development where appropriate. The precise boundary of individual sites to be released will be based on an assessment of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) an acceptable environment can be provided for housing-led development, including its impact on local traffic levels; ii) a housing-led development would prejudice the ability of nearby businesses to operate; iii) the employment land release would prejudice the implementation of the Elstree Way Corridor Planning and Design Brief and other Council economic development and regeneration strategies; and whether iv) any adverse effects on the built and natural environment can be avoided, mitigated and/or compensated |
|--|--|

Scale of Effect (SE): ST – Short Term, MT – Medium Term, LT – Long Term
 0 – no effect; +++ strongly positive; ++ moderately positive; + slightly positive; --- strongly negative; -- moderately negative; - slightly negative

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|---------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|---------------------------|--|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| SOCIAL | | | | | | | |
| 1 | To improve educational achievement, training and opportunities for lifelong learning and employability | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 2 | To ensure ready access to essential services and facilities for all residents | By focusing new employment use in existing established employment areas will ensure good accessibility for opportunities to employment. The positive effects are likely to be permanent and be consistent in the short, | ++ | ++ | ++ | | In combination with sustainable transport policies (CS21 and 22), opportunities for accessibility are likely to be enhanced significantly. The |

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|----------------------|---|---|--------------------|----|-----|---------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | medium and long term. | | | | | scale and significance of these positive effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD. |
| 3 | To meet identified housing needs and improve the quality and affordability of housing | This policy allows for the release of existing employment sites for new housing where appropriate through the Site Allocations DPD. The release of sites would contribute to providing sites to meet identified housing targets and housing needs resulting in overall positive effects. The effects are assessed as being minor and dependent on the findings of the urban capacity study and employment study and the likely shortfall/surplus in both housing and employment uses. | + | ++ | +++ | | The scale and significance of these positive effects will be confirmed through the SA of the Site Allocations DPD where the boundaries of existing employment and housing sites are identified. |
| 4 | To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 5 | To reduce and prevent crime, fear of crime and anti social behaviour | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| 6 | To improve population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| ENVIRONMENTAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites | Redistribution of land may result in more efficient use of land in general with employment land being situated in suitable areas and vice versa with housing land. This will have a minor positive effect. | + | + | + | | |
| 8 | To reduce contamination and safeguard soil quality and quantity | The loss of poorly located employment sites or sites within housing areas presents the opportunity for decontamination of land and improvements to soil quality locally. The application of CS Policy 15 will allow for remediation of contaminated land. The re-distribution of employment sites will seek to safeguard soil quality and quantity elsewhere. The effect will be positive but not significant. | + | + | + | | Measures should be taken during construction and operation to minimise contamination risk. |
| 9 | To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the | Development within exiting employment sites should help to protect landscape character and cultural heritage. | + | + | + | | |

| SA Objectives | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation | |
|---------------|--|---|-----|----|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | ST | MT | LT | | | |
| | community | | | | | | |
| 10 | To maintain and enhance the quality of the countryside and landscape | As above. | + | + | + | | |
| 11 | To reduce dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes | Provision of employment land in settlements should reduce the need for travel between housing and employment. There maybe some short term negative effects while routes are established between new employment land and housing and reliance is still partly on the private car. In the medium to long term this should improve resulting in minor positive, permanent but not significant effects. | -/+ | + | + | Early development of work travel plans to minimise short term negative effects. Establishment of good, frequent and reliable public transport links. | Cross reference to Core Policy CS 21 relating to encouraging green travel plans. |
| 12 | To protect and enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale | Development within exiting employment sites should help to protect habitats and species. | + | + | + | | |
| 13 | To improve the quality of surface and ground waters | The redevelopment of poorly located employment sites may result in localised surface water run-off and pressure on existing water treatment systems. The effect will be positive but not significant. | - | - | - | Mitigation measures during construction and operation to minimise pollution risk. | Successful implementation of Core Policy 15 should help to minimise the effects of new development. |
| 14 | To minimise water consumption | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | Reference to BREEAM offices during design to minimise water consumption. See CS Policy 15. |
| 15 | To minimise the risk of flooding and take account of climate change | Development of designated employment land for housing and vice versa is likely to increase pressure on drainage systems and potentially increase the risk of flooding. The effects are likely to be negative and permanent but the significant of the effect will depend on the location and extent of redevelopment of employment sites for housing. | - | - | - | Development decisions must be guided by the principles of PPS25. Developments should also be designed to be capable of withstanding flood events i.e. by identifying appropriate ground and basement floor uses. Flood risk assessments will be required for the development of sites that lie within flood zones 2 and 3 as defined by the Environment Agency. | Successful implementation of Core Policy 15 should help to minimise the effects of new development. |
| 16 | To improve local air quality | Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of employment land in established settlements would have a minor positive effect on air quality on a permanent basis. The positive effect if existing areas are of high public transport accessibility. However during construction there maybe some negative effects on air quality in the short term. | +/- | + | + | Measures to reduce any pollution during the construction phase through the implementation/reference to a Construction and Environment Management Plan. | Successful implementation of Core Policy 15 should help to minimise the effects of new development. |
| 17 | To reduce greenhouse gas emissions | Possible reduction in car use and the need to travel due to provision of employment land in accessible locations would have a minor positive effect on reducing | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | Reference to BREEAM office to ensure good design which promotes energy efficiency. |

Sustainability Appraisal Report - Appendices

| SA Objectives | | Description of Effect | Duration of Effect | | | Description of Mitigation | Comments / Explanation |
|-----------------|--|---|--------------------|----|----|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | ST | MT | LT | | |
| | | greenhouse gas emissions in the long term. | | | | | Recommend cross referencing to Core Policy 23 in promoting alternatives to the car and ensuring green travel plans are in place in new development (CS Policy 22) to strengthen policy. Successful implementation of such policies should contribute to this objective. |
| 18 | To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| 19 | To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste | No obvious effects. | 0 | 0 | 0 | n/a | |
| ECONOMIC | | | | | | | |
| 20 | To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy | The redistribution of employment sites on the basis of improving the ease and attractiveness of development (through selective release of sites) should help to increase take up of employment sites for development as well as enabling development of former employment sites for alternative uses. Significant positive effects are likely to be Borough wide. | ++ | ++ | ++ | Not required as effect positive. | |
| 21 | To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres | The release of constrained employment sites within town centres for alternative forms of development may have benefits for town centre vitality and viability through enabling beneficial development of vacant/under-used sites, for example for housing or leisure uses. Significant positive effects are likely to be permanent. | + | + | + | Not required as effect positive. | |

Appendix G – Summary of SAR Consultation Comments

| Name | Chapter | Representation | CouncilResponse |
|------------------|---|---|--|
| GO- East | 1.31 Sustainability and alternative options | A link in general should be made to the sustainability appraisal, habitats directive and the community strategy, as it could be a good basis for why particular designations are made. | Noted. Greater cross-referencing will be made between paragraphs 2.31 and 1.31-1.33 and Table 3 |
| GO- East | 2.1 Spatial Vision | There should be a greater spatial emphasis in terms of where the focus of change will occur. Structure of the plan should be revised for clarity, suggestion of a 'Spatial Portrait' to bring together a section of baseline conditions/background that is spread throughout the document currently. Considering the referencing of policies in the overall wording, to remove the number of cross-references and the lists of supporting policies to produce a succinct plan | Noted. Following subsequent discussions with GO-East, the relevant parts of the Core Strategy will be redrafted to include a greater special emphasis and local specificity, although the ability to deliver a truly spatial plan is also dependent on other stakeholders / service providers giving a clear indication of their future land use requirements; this has not always been possible. It is not considered necessary to restructure the entire document but changes will be made where possible to improve the format of the Core Strategy. The cross-referencing within policies, however repetitious it may appear, was included as a consequence of the Sustainability Appraisal recommendations which sought to ensure there were some environmental 'checks and balances' in some of the key policies.. |
| Shire Consulting | 2.14 Alternative Options | More consideration should be given to increasing densities. | Hertsmere is a relatively low density area of this part of England. Higher density development was considered through the Sustainability Appraisal but the density increases required to prevent development of Green Belt land would be well in excess of what is approved in most parts of the Borough and unlikely to be in keeping with the area and / or acceptable to the local community. |
| Shire Consulting | Policy CS13 Protection and enhancement of historic assets | Much of this policy simply repeats national guidance. (Considered unsound under PPS 12.) | The Sustainability Appraisal guided the Council in the overall framing of these policies. |
| GO- East | Policy CS13 Protection and enhancement of historic assets | As in CS12 it is thought to repeat that of national policy. It would be considered appropriate to combine these two policies. | The Sustainability Appraisal guided the Council in the overall framing of these policies. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>English Nature - Essex Herts & London Team</p> | <p>Policy CS2 Housing beyond existing built up areas</p> | <p>Welcome the inclusion of natural conservation value and landscape conservation value criteria for the identification of Green Belt housing sites. An outline of how this approach will be developed and implemented should be addressed. This approach should then be incorporated into the explanatory text of the finalised policy.</p> | <p>Support noted. Detailed criteria will be covered in supporting studies for the Site Allocations DPD although the Sustainability Appraisal sets out the Council's overarching sustainability objectives, includes those relating to landscape and nature conservation.</p> |
| <p>English Nature - Essex Herts & London Team</p> | <p>Table 21 Monitoring Framework</p> | <p>The proposed monitoring framework in Table 21 requires some editing to enable it report adequately on changes to resources. Relevant indicators must be identified as it has been done in the sustainability appraisal framework.</p> | <p>We will review this Table</p> |
| <p>Woodland Trust</p> | <p>Table 6. LDF Core Strategy Objectives</p> | <p>Objective 5. 'To address issues arising from climate change and flooding and to take advantage of water and other natural resources responsibly' We would like to see this objective strengthened and reworded to provide greater clarity. The objective needs to explicitly state that it will address the need to mitigate and adapt to climate and we would suggest that the issue of resource use should be dealt with in a separate objective that incorporates the concept of environmental limits as outlined in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 'Securing the future' (Defra, 2005). Thus the two objectives would read: • 'To address the urgent need to mitigate the effects climate change and devise strategies for adaptation to climate change' • 'To ensure the sustainable use of natural resources respecting the borough's environmental limits' Further information in support of objective 5: Open green space such as woodland can make a significant contribution towards mitigating g the effects of climate change: woodland's role as a carbon sink for CO2 emissions is well known and it can also help absorb air pollution and improve water quality. In addition woodland can assist in control of flood run-off from</p> | <p>There has to be a limit on the number of objectives to ensure that the Core Strategy remains a manageable document. Objective 5 is considered to cover the point raised in the representation and has tested through the Sustainability Appraisal. In respect of the Objective 5, it is not considered necessary to list all types of natural resources and so no change is necessary in that respect. Paragraph 6.4 is being amended to include Woodland with Key Community facilities.</p> |