

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

Sustainability Appraisal Report:
Appendices A,B,C,D

December 2010

Client: Hertsmere Borough Council

Appendices

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 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)	
Objectives	Need to ensure that migratory species are

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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>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>EC White Paper: Adapting to climate change: Towards a European framework for action (2009)</p>	
<p>The White Paper proposes an EU framework on adaptation to strengthen the EU's resilience to cope with the impacts of a changing climate. It builds on the wide-ranging consultation launched in 2007 by the Green Paper on Adapting to Climate Change in Europe. The framework will evolve as further evidence becomes available. It will complement actions by Member States and support wider international efforts to adapt to climate change.</p> <p>The White Paper establishes a framework for action focusing on four key pillars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building a stronger knowledge base - Taking climate change impacts into consideration in key EU policies - Financing – combining different policy measures to the best effect - Supporting wider international efforts on adaptation 	<p>Reducing greenhouse gas emissions will be a key sustainability issue for Hertsmere. Consider Including objectives to address climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
<p>EU Rural Development Policy 2007-2013</p>	
<p>This policy is all about meeting the challenges faced by rural areas and unlocking their potential, and is focused on three thematic axes:</p>	<p>SA objectives to ensure these factors are</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improving the competitiveness of the agricultural and forestry sector - Improving the environment and the countryside - Improving the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification of the rural economy. <p>To help ensure a balanced approach to policy, Member States and regions are obliged to spread their rural development funding between all three of these thematic axes.</p> <p>A new feature for this policy is a greater emphasis on coherent strategy for rural development across the EU as a whole. This is being achieved through the use of National Strategy Plans which must be based on EU Strategic Guidelines. This approach should help to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify the areas where the use of EU support for rural development adds the most value at EU level - Make the link with the main EU priorities - Ensure consistency with other EU policies, in particular those for economic cohesion and the environment - Assist the implementation of the new market oriented common agricultural policy and the necessary restructuring it will entail in the old and new Member States. 	<p>considered.</p>
<p>EU Thematic Strategy on Air Quality (2005)</p>	
<p>The CAFÉ Programme forms the basis of the Thematic Strategy for Air Pollution for the EU. The Strategy sets health and environmental objectives and emission reduction targets for the main pollutants.</p> <p>The aim of the CAFE Programme is to establish a long-term, integrated strategy to tackle air pollution and to protect against its effects on human health and the environment. CAFE's objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To develop, collect and validate scientific information on the effects of air pollution. - To support the correct implementation and review the effectiveness of existing legislation and to develop new proposals as and when necessary. - To ensure that the requisite measures are taken at the relevant level, and to develop structural links with the relevant policy areas. <p>To develop an integrated strategy to include appropriate objectives and cost-effective measures. The thematic strategy on air quality identifies that despite significant improvements in air quality across the EU, a number of serious air quality issues still persist. The strategy promotes an approach, which focuses upon the most serious pollutants, and that more is done to integrate environmental concerns into other policies and programmes.</p> <p>The objective of the strategy is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To attain levels of air quality that do not give rise to significant negative impacts on and risks to human health and the environment. <p>The strategy emphasises the need for a shift towards less polluting modes of transport and the better use of natural resources to help reduce harmful emissions.</p>	<p>The SA framework should aim to include objectives that address the protection of air Quality and assess whether appropriate monitoring and control of air emissions is in place.</p>
<p>Groundwater Directive (GWD) (2006/118/EC)</p>	
<p>The Water Framework Directive sets objectives for groundwater quality, including an objective to meet "good chemical status" by 2015, an objective on pollution trends, and an objective to prevent or limit the input of pollutants to groundwater. Clarification of the objectives, however, is left to the daughter directive.</p> <p>The Directive is designed to prevent and combat groundwater pollution. Its provisions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - criteria for assessing the chemical status of groundwater - criteria for identifying significant and sustained upward trends in groundwater pollution levels, and for defining starting points for reversing these trends - preventing and limiting indirect discharges (after percolation through soil or subsoil) of pollutants into groundwater 	<p>Preserving and enhancing groundwater sources, and reducing sources of pollution will be incorporated into objectives and indicators.</p>

Waste Framework Directive (2006/12/EC)	
<p>The 1975 framework Directive on waste was revised by a number of amendments and a new codified version came into force in 2006. This is the only legally valid version of the Waste Framework Directive.</p> <p>The Directive establishes a framework for the management of waste across the European Community. It requires Member States to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Give priority to waste prevention and encourage reuse and recovery of waste - Prohibit the uncontrolled disposal of waste - Establish an integrated network of disposal installations - Prepare waste management plans - Ensure that the cost of disposal is borne by the waste holder - Ensure waste carriers are registered - Ensure that is recovered or disposed of without endangering human health. <p>The Directive's overarching requirements are supplemented by other Directives for other waste streams.</p>	The SA should take into account the fact that waste will be created, which will need to be managed.
EU Air Quality Framework Directive (96/62/EC)	
<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>	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.
EU Directive to Promote Electricity from Renewable Energy (2001/77/EC)	
<p>Objectives</p> <p>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>Targets</p> <p>The UK target is for renewables to account for 10% of UK consumption by 2010.</p>	Promoting renewable energy to meet national target will be a key sustainability issue for Hertsmere. Include specific SA objective.
EU Water Framework Directive (00/60/EC)	
<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</p>	Preserving and enhancing surface and groundwater sources, and reducing sources of pollution will be incorporated into objectives and indicators.

<p>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>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>	
<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><u>Securing the Future - UK Sustainable Development Strategy</u></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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Consider relevance of the 64 UK Framework Indicators when developing local SA indicators to ensure compatibility.</p>
<p><u>Working with the grain of Nature – A biodiversity strategy for England</u></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: 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. Water: aiming for a whole catchment approach to the wise, sustainable use of water and wetlands. Woodland: managing and extending woodland so as to promote enhanced biodiversity and quality of life. 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. 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><u>UK Climate Change Programme (2000)</u></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 Improve business's use of energy, stimulate investment and cut costs; Stimulate new, more efficient sources of power generation;</p>	<p>Energy use, domestic and business energy efficiency, and sustainable travel should be considered as potential SA objectives</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>Cut emissions from the transport sector; Promote better energy efficiency in the domestic sector.</p>	
<p>UK Air Quality Strategy 2007</p>	
<p>This Strategy sets out air quality objectives and policy options to further improve air quality in the UK from today into the long term. As well as direct benefits to public health, these options are intended to provide important benefits to quality of life and help to protect our environment.</p> <p>This updated strategy provides a clear, long-term vision for improving air quality in the UK and offers options for further consideration to reduce the risk to health and the environment from air pollution. It sets out a way forward for work and planning on air quality issues, details objectives to be achieved, and proposes measures to be considered further to help reach the objectives.</p> <p>The strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sets out a way forward for work and planning on air quality issues - sets out the air quality standards and objectives to be achieved - introduces a new policy framework for tackling fine particles - identifies potential new national policy measures which modelling indicates could give further health benefits and move closer towards meeting the Strategy's objectives. <p>This review of the previous Air Quality Strategy (2003) proposes potential new policy measures to improve air quality, and examines their costs and benefits, the impact on exceedances of the strategy's air quality objectives, the effect on ecosystems and also the qualitative impacts.</p> <p>This strategy sets out an agenda for the longer term, in particular the need to find out more about how air pollution impacts on people's health and the environment, to help inform options and future policy decisions. It sets out a framework to achieve cleaner air that will bring health and social benefits.</p>	<p>The SA should include objectives that address the protection of air quality and ensure that provisions are in place for air emissions to be appropriately monitored and controlled.</p>
<p>Waste Strategy for England (2007, DEFRA)</p>	
<p>The aim of this strategy is to encourage a reduction in waste by making products with fewer natural resources. Most products should be re-used or their materials recycled, energy should be recovered where possible and land filling of residual waste, in small amounts, may be necessary. The strategy highlights that significant progress has been made since the 2000 strategy. However, the UK's performance still lags behind other European countries.</p> <p>The Government's key objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To decouple waste growth from economic growth re-use - Meet and exceed the Landfill Directive diversion targets for biodegradable municipal waste in 2010, 2013 and 2020 - Increase diversion from landfill of non-municipal waste and secure better integration of treatment for municipal and non-municipal waste - Secure the investment in infrastructure needed to divert waste from landfill and for the management of hazardous waste - Get the most environmental benefit from investment through increased recycling of resources and recovery of energy from residual waste using a mix of technologies. <p>The strategy address hazardous waste and states that policies will be pursued to reduce hazardous waste arising. The Government is seeking to identify ways to recover material and energy resources from hazardous waste.</p>	<p>The SA should consider objectives to reduce waste production and encourage greater recycling produced.</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.</p>	<p>Efficient use of water a key resource issue in Hertfordshire. Should be reflect in SA</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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>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>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 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>Incorporate in SA objectives</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>Key principles, especially the waste hierarchy, should be considered in developing Hertsmere's SA objectives</p> <p>Encouraging better waste management will</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<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>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</p> <p>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;</p> <p>to maintain the reliability of energy supplies;</p> <p>to promote competitive markets in the UK and beyond, helping to raise the rate of sustainable economic growth and to improve our productivity; and</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>Improve the health of the worst off in society and narrow the health gap.</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>Reduce the death rate from cancer in people under 75 by at least one fifth;</p> <p>Reduce the death rate from coronary heart disease and stroke and related diseases in people under 75 by at least two fifths;</p> <p>Reduce the death rate from suicide and undetermined injury by at least one fifth;</p> <p>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>Consider improving health of the population as potential SA objective; take targets into account</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.</p> <p>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>Climate Change Act 2008</p>	
<p>The UK Government is committed to addressing both the causes and consequences of climate change and has therefore introduced a Climate Change Act. The Act creates a new approach to managing and responding to climate change in the UK through: setting ambitious targets, taking powers to help achieve them, strengthening the institutional framework, enhancing the UK's ability to adapt to the impact of climate change and establishing clear and regular accountability to the UK, Parliament and devolved legislatures.</p>	<p>Reducing greenhouse gas emissions will be a key sustainability issue for Hertsmere. Consider Including objectives to address climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<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</p> <p>To improve conditions for vulnerable people in private accommodation.</p> <p>To ensure all tenants, social and private, get an excellent service from their landlord.</p> <p>To ensure all communities have a clean, safe and attractive environment in which people can take pride.</p> <p>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;</p> <p>recreate sustainable communities;</p> <p>ensure we prevent the repetition of such serious problems in the the longer term;</p> <p>support the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal by tackling the deprivation prevalent in low demand areas.</p> <p>To tackle the housing shortage, especially in London and the wider South East, by:</p> <p>creating conditions in which private house builders will build more homes of the right type in the right places;</p> <p>addressing immediate and urgent needs for more affordable housing, both for key workers and those who would otherwise be homeless;</p> <p>making best use of the existing housing stock.</p> <p>To work towards a better balance in the housing market in the longer term.</p> <p>To do all this in a way that ensures communities are sustainable, enhances the overall environment and protects the countryside.</p> <p>To ensure that in tackling housing shortages we protect the countryside and enhance its quality rather than create urban sprawl.</p> <p>To address the housing needs of rural communities who are often the guardians of the countryside.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To alleviate pressures on services and housing caused by economic success where these pressures cannot readily be dealt with within existing towns and cities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 (2005)</p> <p>Provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population;</p> <p>Provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas;</p> <p>Retain attractive landscapes, and enhance townscapes, near to where people live;</p> <p>Improve damaged & derelict land around towns;</p> <p>Secure nature conservation interest; and</p> <p>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 8: Telecommunications (2001)</p> <p>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 (2001)</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><u>Planning Policy Guidance Note 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation (2002)</u></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><u>Planning Policy Guidance Note 19: Outdoor advertisement control (1992)</u></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><u>Planning Policy Guidance Note 24: Planning and noise (1994)</u></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><u>Planning Policy Statement 1: Creating sustainable development (2005)</u></p>	
<p>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><u>Planning Policy Statement 1 (Supplement): Planning and Climate Change (2007)</u></p>	
<p>This PPS supplement sets out how spatial planning (in providing for the new homes, jobs and infrastructure needed by communities) should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change (mitigation) and take into account the unavoidable consequences (adaptation).</p> <p>The key planning objectives of the PPS seek to: - Make a full contribution to delivering the Government's Climate Change Programme and energy policies, and in doing so contribute to global sustainability - In providing for the homes, jobs, services and infrastructure needed by communities, and in renewing and shaping the places where they live and work, secure the highest viable resource and energy efficiency and reduction in emissions</p>	<p>These objectives should be taken into account and be reflected in the SA objectives.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deliver patterns of urban growth and sustainable rural developments that help secure the fullest possible use of sustainable transport for moving freight, public transport, cycling and walking; and, which overall, reduce the need to travel, especially by car - Secure new development and shape places that minimise vulnerability, and provide resilience, to climate change; and in ways that are consistent with social cohesion and inclusion - Conserve and enhance biodiversity, recognising that the distribution of habitats and species will be affected by climate change - Reflect the development needs and interests of communities and enable them to contribute effectively to tackling climate change - Respond to the concerns of business and encourage competitiveness and technological innovation in mitigating and adapting to climate change 	
<p>Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006)</p>	
<p>Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) underpins the delivery of the Government's strategic housing policy objectives and the goal is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford in a community where they want to live.</p>	<p>Housing is key issue to be addressed through SA objectives</p>
<p>Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2009)</p>	
<p>Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) sets out the Government's comprehensive policy framework for planning for sustainable economic development in urban and rural areas. The Government's overarching objective is sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>To help achieve sustainable economic growth, the Government's objectives for planning are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - build prosperous communities by improving the economic performance of cities, towns, regions, sub-regions and local areas, both urban and rural - reduce the gap in economic growth rates between regions, promoting regeneration and tackling deprivation - deliver more sustainable patterns of development, reduce the need to travel, especially by car and respond to climate change - promote the vitality and viability of town and other centres as important places for communities. To do this, the Government wants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new economic growth and development of main town centre uses to be focused in existing centres, with the aim of offering a wide range of services to communities in an attractive and safe environment and remedying deficiencies in provision in areas with poor access to facilities • competition between retailers and enhanced consumer choice through the provision of innovative and efficient shopping, leisure, tourism and local services in town centres, which allow genuine choice to meet the needs of the entire community (particularly socially excluded groups) • the historic, archaeological and architectural heritage of centres to be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced to provide a sense of place and a focus for the community and for civic activity • raise the quality of life and the environment in rural areas by promoting thriving, inclusive and locally distinctive rural communities whilst continuing to protect the open countryside for the benefit of all 	<p>Sustainable economic growth should be reflected in the economic SA objectives.</p>
<p>Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)</p>	
<p>This PPS sets out the Government's planning policies on the conservation of the historic environment.</p> <p>The value of the historic environment, and the contribution it makes to our cultural, social and economic life, is set out in the Government's Statement on the Historic Environment for England 2010. Planning has a central role to play in conserving our heritage assets and utilising the historic environment in creating sustainable places. This PPS comprises policies that will enable the Government's vision for the historic environment as set out in the 2010 Statement to be implemented through the planning system, where appropriate.</p> <p>The Government's overarching aim is that the historic environment and its heritage assets should be conserved and enjoyed for the quality of life they bring to this and future generations. To achieve this, the Government's objectives for planning for the historic environment are:</p>	<p>SA objective relating to protection of the historic environment should be considered as part of the SA.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to deliver sustainable development by ensuring that policies and decisions concerning the historic environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – recognise that heritage assets are a non-renewable resource – take account of the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of heritage conservation; and – recognise that intelligently managed change may sometimes be necessary if heritage assets are to be maintained for the long term. • to conserve England’s heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance by ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – decisions are based on the nature, extent and level of that significance, investigated to a degree proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset – wherever possible, heritage assets are put to an appropriate and viable use that is consistent with their conservation – the positive contribution of such heritage assets to local character and sense of place is recognised and valued; and – consideration of the historic environment is integrated into planning policies, promoting place-shaping. • to contribute to our knowledge and understanding of our past by ensuring that opportunities are taken to capture evidence from the historic environment and to make this publicly available, particularly where a heritage asset is to be lost. 	
<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>Consultation paper on a new Planning Policy Statement: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment (March 2010)</p>	
<p>A key objective of this single new PPS is therefore to bring together related policies on the natural environment and on open and green spaces in rural and urban areas to ensure that the planning system delivers healthy sustainable communities which adapt to and are resilient to climate change and gives the appropriate level of protection to the natural environment.</p>	<p>These objectives should be taken into account during the SA process.</p>

<p>Another objective for the streamlining and consolidation of policy in this area is to deliver, for the first time, planning policy on green infrastructure. Key considerations for green infrastructure are the functions or ecosystem services it provides. It should therefore be considered at a broader scale than is necessarily the case for individual areas of open space. Natural England, for example, suggests that it should consider the “landscape context, hinterland and setting, as well as strategic links of sub-regional scale and beyond”. It should also take into account the contribution that private assets (e.g. back gardens) as well as public assets (e.g. parks) make to green infrastructure.</p> <p>Therefore, while the existing planning policies and approach on the different components of the natural environment and on open and green spaces remain valid, and taken together go a long way to delivering many of the components of green infrastructure, the new policy recognises that there are subtle differences between planning for open space and planning for green infrastructure.</p> <p>Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning. This means that as well as providing for the development needs of all in the community, contributing to economic growth and supporting social justice, planning should ensure that development is delivered in a way which protects and enhances the natural environment and provides places which contribute to the quality of life, health and wellbeing of those living and working there.</p> <p>To achieve this overarching aim, it is the Government’s policy that planning should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conserve and enhance the natural environment, including the quality, character and value of the landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and soil within rural and urban areas by ensuring that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the natural environment is integrated into the strategic vision of communities – policies and decisions are based on an understanding of the nature, extent and value of the natural environment and recognise its importance; and – construction, development and regeneration has minimal impacts on biodiversity and should enhance it wherever possible to contribute to the overall aim of no net loss to biodiversity. • minimise vulnerability of places, people and wildlife to the impacts of climate change and contribute to effective climate change adaptation measures by maintaining, creating and improving networks of green infrastructure within both urban and rural areas • deliver safe and attractive places to live, which respect the character of the area, promote health and wellbeing, and reduce social inequalities by ensuring that people have access to high quality open spaces, green infrastructure and sports, recreational and play spaces and facilities which are safely and easily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport • provide access and appropriate recreational opportunities in rural and coastal areas to enable urban and rural dwellers to enjoy the wider countryside. 	
<p>Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for sustainable waste management</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>reflect the concerns and interests of communities, the needs of waste collection authorities, waste disposal authorities and business, and encourage competitiveness;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>– ensure the design and layout of new development supports sustainable waste management.</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>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning (2008)</p>	
<p>Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) explains what local spatial planning is, and how it benefits communities. It also sets out what the key ingredients of local spatial plans are and the key government policies on how they should be prepared. It should be taken into account by local planning authorities in preparing development plan documents and other local development documents.</p>	<p>This PPS should be taken into account during the LDF preparation.</p>
<p>Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable energy</p>	
<p>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</p>	
<p>Reduce air and water pollution Manage waste in a sustainable manner Use brownfield / contaminated land sites to maintain or enhance biodiversity</p> <p>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>Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (2010)</p>	
<p>Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) sets out Government policy on development and flood risk. Its aims are to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding, and to direct development away from areas of highest risk. Where new development is, exceptionally, necessary in such areas, policy aims to make it safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, reducing flood risk overall.</p>	<p>Consider including flood risk as part of well-being / climate change SA objectives</p>
<p>Local Development Framework Monitoring: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM, 2005)</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>Key contextual topics for indicators</p> <p>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.</p> <p>LDF core output indicators</p> <p>BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT 1a Amount of land developed for employment by type.</p>	<p>Key guidance for SA/SEA process and how to integrate with LDF preparation.</p> <p>Contextual indicators topics relevant to SA/SEA baseline.</p> <p>Output indicators generally not appropriate for SA/SEA but will need to be incorporated into LDF monitoring.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>MINERALS (for minerals planning authority only) 5a Production of primary land won aggregates. 5b Production of secondary/recycled aggregates.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>FLOOD PROTECTION AND WATER QUALITY 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</p>	
--	--

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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</p> <p>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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>Indicators</p> <p>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:</p> <p>To reduce the region's impact on and exposure to the effects of climate change by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> locating development so as to reduce the need to travel; 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>To increase housing opportunities for people in the region by:</p>	<p>Ensure that Hertsmere's SA objectives are consistent with the objectives for the emerging RSS.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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. 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. 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. 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 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.</p>	<p>Incorporate objectives and relevant indicators into local SA where appropriate</p>

<p>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 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</p>	
--	--

<p>WATER QUALITY & RESOURCES</p> <p>10 Chemical river water quality</p> <p>11 Biological river water quality</p> <p>12 No. of nitrate vulnerable zones/Environmentally sensitive areas</p> <p>13 Area designated nitrogen Vulnerable zone</p> <p>14 Agri-env. / organic farming schemes</p> <p>15 Groundwater conditions</p> <p>16 Estuarine water quality</p> <p>17 Bathing water quality</p> <p>18 Abstraction rate of non-tidal water</p> <p>19 Reservoir volumes</p> <p>20 Average soil moisture deficit in mm</p> <p>21 No. of lakes and Reservoirs over 10ha 185 (Anglian), 10.4% of UK</p> <p>22 Water usage per capita</p> <p>23 Water leakage rate</p> <p>SOIL QUALITY & RESOURCES</p> <p>24 Agricultural land resource (thousand hectares)</p> <p>25 Soil Quality</p> <p>26 Loss of greenfield land</p> <p>27 % land designated as Green Belt</p> <p>28 Houses affected by structural problems</p> <p>29 Amount of contaminated land 300,000 ha (estimate)</p> <p>30 Stock of vacant / brownfield land (2002)</p> <p>31 Construction industry key performance indicators</p> <p>32 % of housing built on brownfield sites</p> <p>33 Consumption of aggregates per capita</p> <p>34 Waste production by type (m tonnes)</p> <p>35 Total household waste (kg/person/year)</p> <p>36 Household waste recycled or composted (kg/person/year)</p> <p>37 % waste landfilled</p> <p>38 % waste recycled</p> <p>39 Waste production per capita per year</p> <p>AIR QUALITY - OUTPUT FACTORS/EVIDENCE</p> <p>40 No. of moderate or poor air quality days 2003</p> <p>41 Air Quality Management Areas</p> <p>AIR QUALITY - CAUSAL FACTORS</p> <p>42 Modal split</p> <p>43 Modal split weighted by distance</p> <p>44 Commuting mode</p> <p>45 Mean journey to work time (minutes)</p> <p>46 Mean journey to work time (minutes)</p> <p>47 Road traffic growth 1993-2002.</p> <p>48 Traffic (billion vehicle kilometres)</p> <p>49 Road congestion</p> <p>50 School journey mode</p> <p>51 Bus availability</p>	
--	--

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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 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</p>	
---	--

<p>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 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</p>	
--	--

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

138 % of people at 19 with NVQ2 or higher qualifications	
Our Environment, Our Future: The Regional Environmental Strategy for the East of England (July 2003)	
<p>Strategic aims</p> <p>SA1 Accommodate population and economic growth whilst protecting and enhancing the environment</p> <p>SA2 Reduce the need to travel and achieve a switch to more sustainable modes of transport</p> <p>SA3 Deliver sustainable design</p> <p>SA4 Reduce vulnerability of the region to climate change</p> <p>SA5 Promote energy conservation and a switch to renewable energy sources</p> <p>SA6 Harness environmental benefits arising from climate change</p> <p>SA7 Improve the environmental awareness, skills, and housekeeping of business and the workforce</p> <p>SA8 Promote the environmental economy</p> <p>SA9 Deliver more sustainable agriculture</p> <p>SA10 Maintain and strengthen landscape and townscape character</p> <p>SA11 Enhance biodiversity</p> <p>SA12 Conserve and enhance the historic environment</p> <p>SA13 Reduce the region's global environmental impact</p> <p>SA14 Increase understanding and ownership of environmental issues</p>	Incorporate objectives and relevant indicators into local SA where appropriate
Revised Regional Housing Strategy for the East of England 2005-2010	
<p>Vision</p> <p>To ensure everyone can live in a decent home at a price they can afford in locations that are sustainable.</p> <p>Aims</p> <p>Use housing investment to support economic development and ensure that the capacity of the housing sector can deliver</p> <p>Provide a sustainable environment and attractive places to live</p> <p>Promote social inclusion within sustainable communities</p> <p>Ensure that housing serves to improve the region's health and well-being and reduce inequalities</p>	Incorporate in SA objectives
A Shared Vision: The regional economic strategy for the East of England (2004)	
<p>Vision</p> <p>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>A skills base that can support a world-class economy</p> <p>Growing competitiveness, productivity and entrepreneurship</p> <p>Global leadership in developing and realising innovation in science</p> <p>High quality places to live, work and visit</p> <p>Social exclusion and broad participation in the regional economy</p> <p>Making the most from the development of international gateways and national and regional transport corridors</p> <p>A leading information society</p> <p>An exemplar for the efficient use of resources.</p>	Incorporate in SA objectives
A Housing Strategy for the London Commuter Belt 2005-2008	
Vision	Incorporate in SA objectives

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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>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. 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.</p>	<p>To be incorporated into SA Objectives</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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:</p> <p>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. 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>Impact upon climate change will be considered in the SA</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.</p>	<p>To be incorporated into sustainability objectives and key issues</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Addressing the development consequences of scarce water resources throughout the region and an increasing sea level for coastal and low lying areas.	
Towns and Cities – Strategy and Action Plan: Urban Renaissance	
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. 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	To be incorporated into SA Objectives
COUNTY	
Hertfordshire Structure Plan 1991-2011	
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.	Incorporate in SA objectives
Hertfordshire Structure Plan Alterations 2001-2016 Deposit Draft Version, February 2003	
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	Incorporate in SA objectives

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>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>The SA will include objectives on the reduction of traffic, improvements to air quality, human health, and the reduction in crime.</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</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>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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>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>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>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>
<p>Hertfordshire Economic Development Strategy 2006-2010</p>	
<p>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</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>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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 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 Reduce inequalities in health and improve lifestyle risk factors Improve the health of vulnerable people</p>	<p>Relates to many of the objectives including reduction of crime, promoting skills, economic growth, affordable homes, accessibility and social inclusion</p>
<p>The Hertfordshire Environmental Strategy (2001)</p>	
<p>Sustainability principles for Hertfordshire: 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. 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.</p>	<p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p>

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.

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.

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 choose 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 services are fully accessible without using private cars...

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.

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.

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>Hertfordshire Waste Strategy 2002-2024</p> <p>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>	<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: 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>	<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> <p>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 biodiversity where appropriate.</p>	<p>Encouraging efficient resource use and environmental preservation to be reflected in SA objectives</p>
<p>Enjoy! A cultural strategy for Hertfordshire 2002-2007</p> <p>Key messages Making Hertfordshire a more prosperous and attractive place to live, work or visit Offering children, young people and adults the opportunity to reach their full potential through access to learning and information Encouraging children and young people to access and enjoy cultural and leisure activities Enabling all members of the community to have more and easier access to different cultural and leisure pursuits Valuing and supporting the diverse range of cultural and leisure activities enjoyed across the county Working in partnership with national, regional and local agencies to deliver a range of cultural and leisure activities effectively</p>	<p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Local Area Agreement</p>	
<p>The Local Area Agreement (LAA) is a new way of working in Hertfordshire. It aims to bring together a wide range of partners to deliver better services and improve the quality of life for Hertfordshire's residents. Some of the key features of the LAA include improved collaboration between public, private and voluntary and community sector agencies as well as greater flexibility to devise local solutions to local circumstances.</p> <p>The LAA is divided into four areas or 'themes': - Children & Young People (CYP) - partners, including the Voluntary and Community Sector, have come together and agreed on issues (outcomes) they</p>	<p>LAA to be taken into account during the SA process.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>believe to be important to children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Economic Development and Enterprise (EDE) - the LAA seeks to build on Hertfordshire's locational advantages in a sustainable way by making better use of existing infrastructure and by supporting residents who are not benefiting from the wealth of the county. - Healthy Communities and Older People (HCOP) - the Healthier Communities and Older People Block aims to improve the health and quality of life of Hertfordshire's residents with a focus on older people, the disabled, and those with limited access to health care. - Safer and Stronger Communities (SSC) - seeks to tackle crime and disorder and create safer and stronger communities. It also seeks to ensure cleaner, safer and greener neighbourhoods by creating quality spaces and managing the environment sustainably. 	
<p>Hertfordshire 2021: A Bright Future</p>	
<p>Hertfordshire Forward's draft Sustainable Community Strategy outlines all of the major challenges faced by the county both now and in the future. It sets out a long term vision for what partners want Hertfordshire to 'be' like in 2021 and a series of objectives and short term actions to be delivered in partnership.</p> <p>The community strategy has identified the following as key areas of concern for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jobs, Prosperity and Skills - Safer and Stronger Communities - Children and Young People - An Ageing Population - Health and Wellbeing - Housing, Affordable Housing and Quality Neighbourhoods - Transport and Access - Sustaining Hertfordshire's Unique Character and Quality of Life - Promoting Sustainable Development 	<p>Key areas of concern to be taken into account during the SA process and to incorporate in SA objectives as appropriate.</p>
<p>A 50 Year Vision for the Wildlife and Natural Habitats of Hertfordshire</p>	
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To establish a plan partnership through identifying and consulting key partners in the process. To produce an overview of our present knowledge of the biodiversity resource in the county. 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. To identify a list of priority species for the preparation of action plans. Concise target statements should be prepared for all chosen species. Within each habitat and species action plan to identify delivery mechanisms and sources of finance and advice. To publish the plan and implement the agreed programme of action. To establish a long term monitoring programme to measure the effectiveness of the Plan in achieving national and local targets. <p>Action plans Have been prepared for the following species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Vole Common Dormouse Natterer's Bat Otter Tree Sparrow Bittern Stone Curlew 	<p>Incorporate in SA objectives</p>

<p>Song Thrush Great Crested Newt Chalkhill Blue Grizzled Skipper Stag Beetle White-clawed Crayfish Great Pignut Cornflower River Water-dropwort Pasqueflower</p>	
<p>LOCAL</p>	
<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) Objectives for sustainable development</p>	<p>Contains existing objectives for sustainable</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>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 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>development. Review in context of recent plans and policies, and incorporate as appropriate into SA for new LDF.</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>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>Hertsmere Contaminated Land Strategy 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 Relevant objectives: Build community confidence and further reduce the fear of crime 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>Relates to many of the objectives including reduction of crime, promoting skills, economic 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>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<p>Hertsmere Supplementary Planning Guidance: Monitoring and Review – Sustainability Indicators (2003)</p> <p>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.) 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>Current set of local sustainability indicators. Update in context of other recent plans/policies and include in new SA where appropriate.</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>Identifies key sustainability objectives / issues. Consider incorporating in Hertsmere’s SA objectives.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<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 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>
<p>Hertsmere Planning and Design Guidance SPD (2006)</p> <p>The purpose of this SPD is to promote higher standards of design and layout in Hertsmere by setting out the key principles that the Council expects to be applied to new developments in the Borough.</p> <p>This Guide will set clear objectives for achieving good quality design, along with guidelines that the Council will take into account when assessing an application. Applications that demonstrate poor design and inconsistency with the key principles set out in the Guide and corresponding Local Plan policies are likely to be refused planning permission on these grounds. Where developments do not require planning permission, it is intended that this Guide will still provide advice to ensure high quality design in all developments.</p>	<p>To be taken into account and incorporate into SA wherever possible.</p>
<p>Hertsmere Affordable Housing SPD (2008)</p>	
<p>The Core Strategy Preferred Options Report (November 2007) proposes 15 objectives for Hertsmere’s Local Development Framework. Of these, the following are identified as being relevant to the Affordable Housing SPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To provide the spatial policies necessary to deliver the land use requirements of the Community Strategy - To maintain an adequate supply of suitable land, concentrated on brownfield sites within towns, to accommodate expected development needs and supporting community infrastructure - To assist the community’s need for Affordable Housing” - To promote safe, healthy and inclusive communities, respecting the diverse needs of the whole Borough. 	<p>Housing is key issue to be addressed through SA objectives</p>

<p>Two additional objectives, specific to this SPD have also been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To contribute towards Government and regional planning objectives related to the development of sustainable communities - To improve partnership working, especially between developers, the Council and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). 	
<p>Hertsmere Parking Standards SPD (2008)</p>	
<p>The Core Strategy Preferred Options Report (November 2007) proposes 15 objectives for Hertsmere's Local Development Framework. Of these objectives, the following are identified as being relevant to the Parking Standards SPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To provide the spatial policies necessary to deliver the land use requirements of the Community Strategy - To raise levels of access by seeking development in locations not dependent on access by car and by requiring the provision of accessible buildings - To promote safe, healthy and inclusive communities, respecting the diverse needs of the whole Borough - To protect and enhance local biodiversity within both developed and undeveloped areas - To secure efficient land use through well-designed development reflecting the size, pattern and character of settlements in Hertsmere. <p>Two additional objectives, specific to this SPD have also been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reduce the carbon emissions of new developments by promoting and providing for alternatives to the private car through the use of Travel Plans, securing of s106 contributions and implementation of other appropriate measures. - To assist the delivery of objectives identified in the Local Transport Plan for Hertfordshire 2006-2011 and associated programmes and local area plans. 	<p>To be taken into account and incorporate into SA wherever possible.</p>
<p>Statement of Community Involvement (2006)</p>	
<p>This statement of community involvement (SCI) has been prepared as part of the Local Development Framework. The SCI is a local development document (LDD), which sets out policy for involving the community, both in preparing and revising LDDs and in development-control decisions.</p> <p>Through the SCI, the Council aim to promote effective public involvement in the planning system. This will help to make sure that all sections of the community, including people who do not normally get involved in the planning process, have the opportunity to contribute to the new system. The Council aim to involve local residents, businesses, landowners, groups and organisations, along with stakeholders such as national and regional organisations, in the process and will place an emphasis on making information widely accessible in all formats, and make use of the Internet, the local press and existing networks of communication.</p> <p>The benefits of continuous community involvement are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - help people understand the planning processes; - work with groups and individuals who would otherwise not get involved; - identify issues of concern; and - provide an opportunity for negotiation on representations made on LDDs and planning applications. 	<p>Public involvement to be taken into account during the SA process.</p>
<p>Hertsmere Community Strategy 2006-2020</p>	
<p>The Community Strategy has been developed by Hertsmere Together, the Local Strategic Partnership, in consultation with other relevant service providers and stakeholders, local voluntary and community groups, local businesses, and the wider general public. This, combined with statistical evidence, ensures that the Strategy reflects local needs and aspirations.</p> <p>Hertsmere Together's Community Strategy aims to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide a long-term vision for the future of Hertsmere - provide a means of joining-up local services and improving partnership working - reflect Hertsmere's needs and aspirations 	<p>Incorporate in SA objectives.</p>

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- prioritise its objectives on Hertsmere's needs and aspirations- identify gaps in the provision of local services- provide a means of tackling cross-cutting issues- provide a means of identifying resources to address the needs of Hertsmere	
---	--

APPENDIX C

Baseline Data Tables

Table C1: Baseline Data

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
Number of people employed	Workplace based count of employment	2001: 55,117 2002: 45,951 2003: 44,995 2004: 41,849 2006: 41,800 2007: 43,300	502,267 487,617	2,271,254 2,277,763	22,057,115 22,175,255	Between 2001 and 2006 employment in the Borough decreased, due in part to the relocation of large employers to sites outside of the Borough. This was 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 remained relatively stable. However, employment increased almost 3.5% between 2006 and 2007.		Material Assets	Annual Business Inquiry.
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 2007: 1.5 2008: 1.4	1.1 1.3 1.5 1.4 1.4 1.6 1.4 1.4	1.7 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 remained beneath both the regional and national average. The Borough experiences low unemployment in relation to the region and the UK as a whole.		Population, Material Assets	NOMIS, Claimant Count in Hertfordshire.
Average weekly earnings		2002: £578.70 2003: £619.30 2004: £627.90 2005: £609.60 2007: £477.2	577.60 604.60 609.60 648.70	501.90 523.60 534.00 549.70 450.0	472.10 487.00 498.60 517.00 458.6	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. The average weekly earnings in Hertsmere decreased approximately 22% between 2005 and 2007.			NOMIS - Annual survey of hours and earnings. Claimant Count in Hertfordshire. https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/ward/1308623984/report.aspx#wab
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	Between 2001 and 2003, the County had consistently performed above both regional and national rates. The regional rate was slightly below the national figure.			Regional Accounts, ONS
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	Between 2001 and 2004, stats showed a steady rate of increase in the number of VAT registered businesses at the local, county, regional and national levels.			NOMIS

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	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 slowed. 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 was a slight decline in the proportion of businesses that were 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 had broadly comparable rates of survival, both of which were slightly above the national average. Results based upon third year of operation. E.g. 2004 results show percentage of businesses registered in 2001 still operational			Small Business Service
Vacant employment land by Class (ha)		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k	Local survey required.			-
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 the national average (AMR)		Hertsmere Retail Surveys
Listed buildings:	Listed Buildings	2008/09: 372 Listed Buildings: 3 Grade I 10 Grade II* Remaining are Grade II	n/k	n/k	n/k				Hertsmere Borough Council website: http://www.hertsmere.gov.uk/planning/developmentcontrol/listedbuildings.jsp Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09.
	b) At risk (number / %)	2005: 0 / 0% 2008/09: 1%	n/k	n/k	n/k	No listed buildings were identified as being at risk in 2005. In 2008/09 only 1% of the Listed Buildings were considered to be at risk.	0% (AMR)		English Heritage Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09.
	c) Lost in previous year	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				-
Ancient monuments:	a) Good condition (number / %)	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				-

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	b) At risk (number / %)	2005: 0 / 0%	n/k	n/k	n/k	No ancient monuments were identified as being at risk in 2005.			English Heritage
	c) Lost in previous year	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				-
Green belt:	Percentage of Green Belt	Around 80% of the Borough is designated Green Belt, covering the whole Borough outside of the main settlements of Borehamwood, Bushey, Potters Bar and Radlett as well as parts of Elstree.					No loss of designated Green Belt (AMR)		Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09.
	a) Total ha	2003: 8,040 2004: 8,040 2005: 8,040 2006: 8,040 2007/08: 8,020 2008/09: 8,020	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, although there was a slight decrease in 2007/09.			http://www.dclg.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1161678 Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09.
	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.			
Number of Conservation Areas		2010: 15 Conservation Areas							http://www.hertsmere.gov.uk/planning/conservation/conservation_areas.jsp
% of conservation areas with an up-to-date character appraisal		2002: 0 2003: 0 2004: 0 2005: 0 2006/07: 7% 2007/08: 7%	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	Between 2002 and 2005 there were no areas with up-to-date character appraisals. In 2006/07 and 2007/08 7% of conservation areas had an up-to-date character appraisal.	2006/07: 27% 2007/08: 13% 40% by 2008		HBC BVPP 2005/2007/2008
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	Between 2004 and 2006 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 between adoption of Local Plan in 2003 and 2006.			Hertsmere BC GIS systems

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
Greenfield land:	a) Total ha	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
	b) Net change	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Percent of new homes built on previously developed land		2002: 97% 2003: 99% 2004: 99.5% 2005: 100% 2006/07: 99.5% 2007/08: 91.0% 2008/09: 97.6%	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 has been well above National and regional targets and achievement rates in delivering housing from PDL. Between 2006/07 and 2007/08 the percentage of new homes built on previously developed land outperformed the targets. Good, monitoring system already in place	2006/07: 95.0% 2007/08: 90.0%		HBC BVPP 2004-05, 2006-2008.
Average density of new housing	a) All development	2004: 48.1dph 2005: 41.5dph 2006: 27.9dph 2007/08: 40dph 2008/09: 42dph	n/k n/k n/k	n/k n/k n/k	n/k n/k n/k	Between 2004 and 2006, the average density of new housing has fallen since measurement started. In 2005/6, the average density fell below 30dwelling per hectare (dph). However, this can largely be attributed to a large number of low density minor schemes and one for one replacements. However, between 2007/08 and 2008/09 the average density increased from 27.9dph to 42dph. Figures show that the target have been outperformed, although in 2006 the average density of new housing was bellow the target. The average dwellings per hectare should remain relatively high unless there are large developments permitted within green belt areas.	To achieve a Borough wide average of at least 30dph.		HBC Housing monitoring. Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09..
	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. Between 2002 and 2006 average densities for major schemes in Hertsmere were above the average for both Hertfordshire and the Region.	PPG3 advocates densities of between 30 and 50dph		HBC Housing monitoring, EERA Annual Monitoring Reports
% 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

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
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. Index based. 1994=100	Reverse long term decline in populations		http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/progress/index.htm
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 was slightly above the national rate. However, it showed signs of improvement, fluctuating around the 1994 level. Index based. 1994=100			http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/progress/index.htm
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 indicated that skylark population remained relatively stable within the County. National and regional figures compared to 1994 base.			National and regional figures from breeding bird survey: http://www.bto.org/bbs/results/bbsreport.htm . Hertfordshire figures from Quality of Life reports: http://www.hertsdirect.org/yrccouncil/hcc/env/you/raiseaware/quality/
	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 increased in Hertfordshire between 2002 and 2005, mirroring national pattern. However, this runs against the trend of decline at the regional level.			
	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.			
Wildlife sites:	a) total ha	2002: n/k 2003: n/k 2004: 950.2 2005: 952.7 2007/08: 884.48 2008/09: 884.48	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 between 2004 and 2005 and decrease between 2005 and 2007/08.. Slight decline in Hertfordshire figures. There were 130 Wildlife Sites in Hertsmere.	No net loss in areas designated for their environmental value		Herts Biological Records Centre <u>Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09..</u>
	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.			
Ecological quality of ponds		n/k	2004: 21% very high 44% good 28% poor 7% very poor	n/k	n/k				HEF QoL 2004

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	a.) Total ha	2004: 30.7 2005: 30.7 2006: 30.7 2007/08: 54.08 2008/09: 54.08 2009: 40.80ha	n/k n/k 2244	n/k n/k n/k	n/k n/k n/k	No change in SSSI designation between 2004 and 2006. In 2007/08 there was an increase from 30.7ha to 54.08ha. Only 2 SSSIs in Hertsmere (Redwell Wood & Castle Lime Works Quarry)	No net loss in areas designated for their environmental value		www.Englishnature.org.uk/special/ssi/reportIndex.cfm Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09.. Audit Commission Area Profiles. http://www.english-nature.org.uk/special/ssi/reportAction.cfm?Report=sdr13&Category=RF&Reference=East+Of+England
	SSSI Condition	2010: 1.38ha unfavourable declining condition 29.35ha unfavourable recovering condition		2010 - Area meeting PSA target: 87.40% - Area favourable: 65.25% - Area unfavourable recovering: 22.15% - Area unfavourable no change: 5.79% - Area unfavourable declining: 6.78% - Area destroyed / part destroyed: 0.02%		Great part of the SSSI in Hertsmere is considered to be in unfavourable condition. However, approximately 72% is considered to be in a recovering condition.			
Local Nature Reserves	a.) Total ha	2004: 86 2005: 86 2006: 86 2007/08: 86 2008/09: 84.16	n/k n/k n/k	n/k n/k n/k	n/k n/k n/k	No change in LNR designation between 2004 and 2007/08. Between 2007/08 and 2008/09 the area decreased from 86ha to 84.16ha. There were 3 Local Nature Reserves in Hertsmere.	No net loss in areas designated for their environmental value		HBC GIS System Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09..
	b.) Condition	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Regionally Important Geological / Geomorphological Sites	Total ha	2007/08: 12.41ha 2008/09: 12.41ha				Between 2007/08 and 2008/09 there were 12.41 ha of Regionally Important Geological / Geomorphological Sites within the Borough.	No net loss in areas designated for their environmental value		Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09..
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				

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
Chemical river quality	% of river length assessed as good chemical quality	2000: 73.55 2002: 54.25 2003: 70.58 2004: 42.29 2005: 42.29	2001: 76 2002: 78 2003: 63 2004: 67	2001:55 2002:55 2003:39 2004:42	2001:66 2002:66 2003:65 2004:62	Between 2001 and 2004 there was a decline in quality at county and regional level though remained stable at the national level. In Hertsmere the percentage of river length assessed as good chemical quality decreased from 73.55% in 2000 to 42.29% in 2005.	EoE: At least 91% Good or Fair by 2005		Environment Agency, HEF QoL Reports, www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/Audit Commission Area Profiles .
Biological river quality	% of river length assessed as good biological quality	2000: 36.53 2002: 36.53 2003: 39.50 2004: 39.50 2005: 39.50	2001: 76 2002: 78 2003: 63 2004: 67	2001:n/k 2002:81 2003:80 2004:77	2001:n/k 2002:68 2003:69 2004:70	Between 2000 and 2005 the percentage of river length assessed as good biological quality remained relatively stable at the local, regional and national level.	EoE: At least 91% Good or Fair by 2005		Environment Agency, HEF QoL Reports, www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/Audit Commission Area Profiles .
River quality objectives: % that passed/failed		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Number of applications where the EA raised objections granted permission		2007/08: 0 2008/09: 0				On target between 2007/08 and 2008/09.	For no permissions to be granted contrary to EA advice		Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09..
Number of developments approved in areas at risk of flooding		2007/08: 0 2008/09: 0				On target between 2007/08 and 2008/09.	For no developments to be in areas at risk of flooding		Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09..
Water use by sector (domestic, industrial, government etc)		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
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	Between 2001 and 2005 trends for all areas were relatively stable though consumption in Hertfordshire were above both the regional and national averages. Figures for the region use Anglian Water consumption as proxy			HEF QoL Reports, www.sustainable-development.gov.uk
Agricultural land resource ('000 ha)		2002: n/k	n/k	1,471	17,154	73% of agricultural land in the region was arable, more than any other UK region			EERA SA 2004
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				

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source																																																																																																																																	
Contaminated land:	a) amount (ha)	n/k	n/k	300,000 (estimated)	n/k				EERA SA 2004																																																																																																																																	
	b) number of sites (BVPP – 'of potential concern to LA')	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k		1090 (HBC)																																																																																																																																			
CO2 emissions:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Region</th> <th>Year</th> <th>Industry and Commercial</th> <th>% Industry and Commercial</th> <th>Domestic</th> <th>% Domestic</th> <th>Road Transport</th> <th>% Road Transport</th> <th>LULUCF</th> <th>% LULUCF</th> <th>Total</th> <th>Population ('000s, mid-year estimate)</th> <th>Per Capita Emissions (t)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Hertsmere</td> <td>2005</td> <td>254</td> <td>27.8</td> <td>250</td> <td>27.5</td> <td>407</td> <td>44.6</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>912</td> <td>94.8</td> <td>9.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>256</td> <td>28.5</td> <td>253</td> <td>28.1</td> <td>389</td> <td>43.3</td> <td>1</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>898</td> <td>96.0</td> <td>9.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>250</td> <td>28.0</td> <td>246</td> <td>27.5</td> <td>397</td> <td>44.3</td> <td>2</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>895</td> <td>97.0</td> <td>9.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">East of England</td> <td>2005</td> <td>16,638</td> <td>36.7</td> <td>13,487</td> <td>29.8</td> <td>14,548</td> <td>32.1</td> <td>617</td> <td>1.36</td> <td>45,289</td> <td>5,563</td> <td>8.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>16,422</td> <td>36.5</td> <td>13,657</td> <td>30.4</td> <td>14,275</td> <td>31.8</td> <td>608</td> <td>1.35</td> <td>44,962</td> <td>5,607</td> <td>8.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>15,782</td> <td>35.8</td> <td>13,250</td> <td>30.0</td> <td>14,439</td> <td>32.7</td> <td>636</td> <td>1.44</td> <td>44,106</td> <td>5,661</td> <td>7.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">UK</td> <td>2005</td> <td>241,524</td> <td>45.9</td> <td>149,568</td> <td>28.4</td> <td>137,186</td> <td>26.1</td> <td>- 1,934</td> <td>- 0.4</td> <td>526,345</td> <td>60240.0</td> <td>8.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>241,650</td> <td>46.0</td> <td>150,782</td> <td>28.7</td> <td>135,036</td> <td>25.7</td> <td>- 1,816</td> <td>- 0.3</td> <td>525,651</td> <td>60587.9</td> <td>8.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>236,401</td> <td>45.8</td> <td>145,725</td> <td>28.2</td> <td>136,361</td> <td>26.4</td> <td>- 1,815</td> <td>- 0.4</td> <td>516,672</td> <td>60975.4</td> <td>8.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As can be seen, between 2005 and 2007 road transport was responsible for almost half of the total CO₂ emissions in Hertsmere and the values were higher than the regional and national levels. Industry and commercial and domestic emissions had the same level of CO₂ emissions between those year.</p>											Region	Year	Industry and Commercial	% Industry and Commercial	Domestic	% Domestic	Road Transport	% Road Transport	LULUCF	% LULUCF	Total	Population ('000s, mid-year estimate)	Per Capita Emissions (t)	Hertsmere	2005	254	27.8	250	27.5	407	44.6	1	0.1	912	94.8	9.6	2006	256	28.5	253	28.1	389	43.3	1	0.1	898	96.0	9.4	2007	250	28.0	246	27.5	397	44.3	2	0.2	895	97.0	9.2	East of England	2005	16,638	36.7	13,487	29.8	14,548	32.1	617	1.36	45,289	5,563	8.1	2006	16,422	36.5	13,657	30.4	14,275	31.8	608	1.35	44,962	5,607	8.0	2007	15,782	35.8	13,250	30.0	14,439	32.7	636	1.44	44,106	5,661	7.8	UK	2005	241,524	45.9	149,568	28.4	137,186	26.1	- 1,934	- 0.4	526,345	60240.0	8.7	2006	241,650	46.0	150,782	28.7	135,036	25.7	- 1,816	- 0.3	525,651	60587.9	8.7	2007	236,401	45.8	145,725	28.2	136,361	26.4	- 1,815	- 0.4	516,672	60975.4	8.5	UK target of reducing CO ₂ emissions by 80% below 1990 levels, by the year 2050	Air, Climatic Factors	Local and Regional CO ₂ Emissions Estimates for 2005-2007', produced by AEA for DECC (http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/climate_change/localco2/localco2.aspx)
Region	Year	Industry and Commercial	% Industry and Commercial	Domestic	% Domestic	Road Transport	% Road Transport	LULUCF	% LULUCF	Total	Population ('000s, mid-year estimate)	Per Capita Emissions (t)																																																																																																																														
Hertsmere	2005	254	27.8	250	27.5	407	44.6	1	0.1	912	94.8	9.6																																																																																																																														
	2006	256	28.5	253	28.1	389	43.3	1	0.1	898	96.0	9.4																																																																																																																														
	2007	250	28.0	246	27.5	397	44.3	2	0.2	895	97.0	9.2																																																																																																																														
East of England	2005	16,638	36.7	13,487	29.8	14,548	32.1	617	1.36	45,289	5,563	8.1																																																																																																																														
	2006	16,422	36.5	13,657	30.4	14,275	31.8	608	1.35	44,962	5,607	8.0																																																																																																																														
	2007	15,782	35.8	13,250	30.0	14,439	32.7	636	1.44	44,106	5,661	7.8																																																																																																																														
UK	2005	241,524	45.9	149,568	28.4	137,186	26.1	- 1,934	- 0.4	526,345	60240.0	8.7																																																																																																																														
	2006	241,650	46.0	150,782	28.7	135,036	25.7	- 1,816	- 0.3	525,651	60587.9	8.7																																																																																																																														
	2007	236,401	45.8	145,725	28.2	136,361	26.4	- 1,815	- 0.4	516,672	60975.4	8.5																																																																																																																														
Air quality	Number of days of air pollution poor / moderate	36	27	2002:Urban 33Rural 45 2003:Urban: 60Rural: 75	2002:Urban 19Rural 34 2003:Urban 51Rural 68	Regional values are approximate averages based on place specific readings.			HEF QoL; EERA SA 2004; Env Health & Housing HBC																																																																																																																																	
	Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)	2010 Hertsmere has 6 AQMAs declared.							UK Air Quality Archive website: http://www.airquality.co.uk/laqm/laqm.php																																																																																																																																	
Energy produced by renewable	a) kWh	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k	Between 2001 and 2005 the proportion of energy from renewable sources slowly increased at a	The UK government		www.sustainable-development.gov.uk																																																																																																																																	

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
sources:	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	National level..	has set a national target for 10% of energy requirements to be provided from renewable sources by 2010. This target is reflected in the East of England Plan, which sets a further target for 17% of energy requirements to be met from renewable sources (excluding offshore wind power) by 2020.		and www.renewableseast.org.uk
% of all homes with renewable energy sources installed		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Total waste collected per annum:	a) total tonnage (thousand tonnes)	2003: n/k	n/k	22,196	224,683				www.sustainable-development.gov.uk
	b) kg per head	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Total waste recycled per annum:	a) total tonnage (thousand tonnes)	2003: n/k	n/k	9,573	95,442				HBC BVPP 2005
	b) kg per head	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
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. Between 2006/07 and 2007/08 the figures for total household waste per head and the percentage of waste recycled and composted	National targets: 30% recycled by 2010, 33% by 2015. HCC		HBC BVPP 2005 Best Value Performance Plan 2008-2009
	b) total sent for recycling/composting	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	c) % recycled/composted	2001: n/k 2002: 8 2003: 10 2004: 12 2005: 11 % recycled 2006/07: 12.46 2007/08: 16.80 % composted 2006/07: 17.40 2007/08: 12.30	n/k 10 13 16 17	15 17 19 23 n/k	11 13 14 18 n/k	were below the targets. Further improvement needed to meet 2015 target and particularly to meet Hertfordshire target of 50% by 2012.	target of 50% by 2012 % recycled 2006/07: 12.00 2007/08: 14.00 % composted 2006/07: 16.00 2007/08: 23.00		
	d) total household waste per head	2001: 377 2002: 380 2003: 417 2004: 414 2005: 416 2006/07: 431.20 2007/08: 417.63	495 503 508 495 507	491 521 520 505 n/k	507 516 520 512 517		Total household waste per head - 2006/07: 446.00 -2007/08: 444.00		
	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				
Ecological footprint (global ha per person)		2004: 5.38	5.31	N/a	5.35	Hertsmere had a larger ecological footprint than the county average and the national average. It ranked 4 th among the 10 Herts LAs			Hertfordshire Biological Records
Private car ownership	(a) % of households with					Herts had one of the highest levels of car ownership in the country. 2006 sample survey for Hertsmere indicated a rise in average car ownership. Small sample of 2006 survey mean differences are not statistically significant.			2001 Census, HBC Parking Survey
	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				

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source	
	b) Average vehicles per household	2001: 1.4 2006: 1.6	1.34 n/k	1.27 n/k	1.11 n/k					
Modal split for journeys	a.) to work					Hertsmere and Hertfordshire had 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	
	Walking	2001: 8% 2005: n/k	9% 8%	10% n/k	11% n/k					
	Cycling	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			
	Walking or cycling	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 were broadly in alignment across geographical areas. Less children using public transport than national average.				
	Walking or cycling	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					

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	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				
Mean average distances for journeys (miles)	a.) to work	2004: n/k	13.1	n/k	n/k				
	b.) shopping	2004: n/k	5.8	n/k	n/k				
	c.) leisure	2004: n/k	10.6	n/k	n/k				
Greenway / Cycleway usage counts (specified locations)		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				Herts Traffic and Transport Data
Length of greenways/ cycleways per head of population		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Trip-generating developments	% of trip generating developments (approved)					Longer term data required to assess trends. Data relates to approved major commercial developments	AMR contains a target for 100% of major commercial developments to have a travel plan and incorporate cycling facilities.		Hertsmere BC AMR
	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				
	c.) located in high accessibility zones	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
Housing tenure	% of households					Hertsmere had slightly higher levels of home ownership than the region or country. The proportion of private lettings was lower than the regional and national figures. National figures refer to England and Wales only.			2001 Census
	Owner occupied: Owns outright	31.61	n/k	30.67	29.46				
	Owner occupied: Owns with a mortgage or loan	42.39	n/k	41.53	38.76				
	Rented from: Council (local authority)	2.09	n/k	11.61	13.24				
	Rented from: Housing Association / Registered Social Landlord	13.99	n/k	4.91	5.95				
	Rented from: Private landlord or letting agency	5.14	n/k	7.57	8.72				
	Rented from: Other	3.6	n/k	3.2	3.22				
Housing Type	Percentage of households living in type of accommodation					The distribution of household accommodation types was closely matched to the regional and national figures.			2001 Census
	Whole house or bungalow: Detached	21.17	n/k	30.17	22.77				
	Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached	33.7	n/k	31.21	31.58				
	Whole house or bungalow: Terraced (including end terrace)	22.66	n/k	23.5	26.04				
	Flat or maisonette	21.7	n/k	12	19.2				
	Caravan or mobile home	0.7	n/k	n/k	0.4				
Index of multiple deprivation	a) Overall rank	0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	2.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	N/a	In 2004, Hertsmere was relatively less deprived than the average for the EoE, although it was less affluent than the Hertfordshire average.			IMD 2004 Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09.

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
		% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England 2004: 1.6% 2007/08: 0% 2008/09: 0%	n/k	n/k		In 2007/08 and 2008/09 10% of SOAs were in the most deprived 20% in Hertfordshire.			
		38.7% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20% % of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in Hertfordshire 2007/08: 10% 2008/09: 10%	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 had a low level of employment disadvantage.		
d)	Education	0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	0.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	5.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	N/a	Hertsmere had fewer educational disadvantages than the County or region.			

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
		0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England	5.9% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England	14.4% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England					
		32.3% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%	52.4% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%	19.2% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%					
	e) Barriers to housing and services	6.5% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	4.5% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	9.0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	N/a	Hertsmere had a high level of disadvantage when it comes to barriers to housing and services. Housing affordability was thought to be the main factor.			
		22.6% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England	14.9% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England	19.1% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England					
		0% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%	14.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%	15.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%					
	f) Health deprivation and disability	0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	0.8% of SOAs are in the most deprived 10% in England	N/a	Hertsmere had a very low level of health and disability deprivation.			
		0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England	0% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England	3.2% of SOAs are in the most deprived 20% in England					
		56.5% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%	50.8% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%	37.0% of SOAs are in the least deprived 20%					
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				
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	16.6 12.4 11.1 12.4 n/k	19.7 16.3 14.6 15.2 n/k	At the regional level, there was a long term trend of decline in the number of long term unemployed. Hertsmere marginally under national rate at 2005.			www.dtistats.net, HCC
% of 18-24 year olds claiming unemployment		17.20%	19.60%	n/k	n/k				

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
related benefits									
Income deprivation	% of under 16s living in income deprived families	13.51	Average of published figures for HCC LAs is 12.75	14 (before housing costs), 23 (after housing costs)	20 (before housing costs), 29 (after housing costs)	Child poverty in Hertsmere was above the County average, and included the SOA with the 2 nd highest level of child poverty in Herts.			HEF QoL
	(below 60% of contemporary median)	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
% 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 was 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
% 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 was lower than the National average and the lowest of all Hertfordshire LAs. Trend of slow increase at the national level.			Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06
General Qualification		68.4% gained 5 GCSEs grade A*-C in 2007 (62.0) Entering higher education 2005/2006: 590	n/k	n/k	Entering higher education 2005/2006: 235,160	Qualifications and skills profile in Hertsmere are improving with more people entering higher education.			Hertsmere Community Profile 2008.
% 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 remained stable between 2001 and 2005.			RSS 14 SA 2004
Child care facilities waiting lists / availability by location		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				Housing services
Public transport accessibility.	% of all uses within accessibility zones	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				Survey and GIS plotting
	Primary schools								
	Secondary schools								
	Child care centres								

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	Other education facilities								
	Retail floorspace								
	Offices (> 1000 sq m)								
	Industrial premises (> 1000 sq m)								
	Leisure centres (gyms, swimming pools etc)								
	Cinema								
	Residential								
	Hospitals								
	Doctors								
	Pharmacies								
	Banks								
	Post offices								
	Job centres								
Proximity of services to population.	% of residences within identified threshold distance of services:	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				Survey and GIS plotting
	Primary school (1500m)								
	Secondary school (3000m)								
	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)								

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	Library (1500m)								
Accessibility to Key Services		2007/08 Primary Sch:100%, Secondary Sch: 100%, Retail: 100%, Employment:100%, GP/Surgeries: 100%, Hospital: 96% 2008/09 Primary Sch:100%, Secondary Sch: 100%, Retail: 100%, Employment:100%, GP/Surgeries: 100%, Hospital: 66%				Between 2007/08 and 2008/09 the accessibility levels to all key services were on target, except to Hospitals which in fact decreased from 96% in 2007/08 to 66% in 2008/09.	For 100% of completed residential development to be within 30 mins public transport of key services		Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09
% 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 placed the council in the top 25% of UK authorities, further work was required to meet the target.	100%		HBC Best Value Performance Plan
% of new development within 1km of good public transport links		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				Survey and GIS plotting
% 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 was very low by national standards			ODPM Regional Quality of Life counts

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
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 was 31 st most unaffordable Local Authority in England and 2 nd most unaffordable in EoE after Cambridge. The number of affordable housing units completed between 2006/07 and 2007/08 decreased from 111 to 95 and the values were below the proposed targets for those years.	Affordable housing units completed during the Year: 2006/07: 123 2007/08: 97		Joseph Rowntree Foundation 'Affordability differences by area for working households buying their homes - 2003 update'. Best Value Performance Plan 2008-2009
	Affordable housing units completed during the year	2006/07: 111 2007/08: 95							
	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				
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
	Homeless Households in Bed and Breakfast Accommodation	n/k	n/k	3.10%	3.70%	New BV indicator.	0%		Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06
	Total number of homelessness applications	2006/07: 390 2007/08: 357				The number of homelessness applications decreased from 390 in 2006/07 to 357 in 2007/08.			Claimant Count in Hertfordshire
% of affordable homes completed as a percentage of		2001: 10 2002: 24 2003: 28	n/k n/k 18	n/k n/k 11	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	For 15% of completions to be affordable		Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06, Regional AMR.

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
all completions		2004: 35 2005: 10 2006/07: 20 2007/08: 25 2008/09: 13	18 22 n/k	13 18 n/k	n/k n/k n/k	increasing provision is emerging. In 2007/08 the percentage of affordable homes completed as a percentage of all completions outperformed the target, however was below the target in 2008/09. The number of Affordable Housing completions rose from 20% in 2006/07 to 25% in 2007/08 but has fallen to 13% in 08/09. This is because a number of new development projects have been put on hold due to economic conditions, whilst completions on a number of on-going projects have slowed down.	(local performance indicator target 2005/06)		Annual Monitoring Report 2008/09
Affordable housing units completed in the year:							50% of completions to be funded through s106 in 2006-08. Target for 235 affordable completions in same period		Hertsmere BVPP 2005/06
a) with subsidy from the Council's assets or resources		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
b) Otherwise through s 106 agreements		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
c) Other		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
d) Total		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Number of people on housing waiting list and average time on list		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Number of abandoned homes		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
Number of unauthorised traveller encampments		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				Gypsy & Traveller needs study
Total crime per 1000 population		2004: n/k 2007: 42.16	92	n/k	113 213	In 2004 and 2007 Herts was below the National average.			Claimant Count in Hertfordshire
Violent crimes per 1000 population		2004: 11.1 2005: 15.4 2006/07: 15.51 2007/08: 12.97	11.9 16.1	n/k n/k	n/k 20	Between 2004 and 2005 Hertsmere was marginally below Hertfordshire figures and national average. In 2006/07 the figure was above the target, however in 2007/08 it outperformed the target.	2006/07: 13.88 2007/08: 15.51		www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk Best Value Performance Plan 2008-2009

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
Domestic burglaries per 1000 population		2004: 16.9 2005: 15.4 2006/07: 12.95 2007/08: 13.69	13.1 12.4	n/k n/k	n/k n/k	Between 2004 and 2005 Hertsmere was marginally above Hertfordshire figures. In 2006/07 and 2007/08 the figures outperformed the targets.	2006/07: 14.41 2007/08: 13.63		Best Value Performance Plan 2008-2009
Fear of crime:	% of people with a high level of worry about					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. Hertsmere and Hertfordshire data both give figures for Herts Policy Authority area.	Increase the number of residents feeling safe by 1% pa to 88% in 2008		HBC BVPP 2005, www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk
	a.) Burglary	9.1 10.5	9.1 10.5	8.6 8.6	13 12				
	b.) Car Crime	12.8 11.0	12.8 11.1	10.9 9.7	15 13				
	c.) Violent Crime	15.9 13.2	15.9 13.3	15.2 14.3	n/k n/k				
Life expectancy at birth	Males	2002: 77.3 2005: 77.8	n/k n/k	n/k n/k	75.9 76.3	Hertsmere was 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
	Females	2002: 80.5 2005: 80.8	n/k n/k	n/k n/k	80.5 80.7				
General health:	% of people describing their health as:					Hertsmere's residents considered themselves healthier than the average for the region and nation. Close correlation between Borough and County figures.			2001 Census
	a) Good	2001: 73.2	73.1	70.4	68.6				
	b) Fairly Good	2001: 20.2	20.3	22.1	22.2				
	c) Not good	2001: 6.6	6.6	7.6	9.2				
People of working age with a limiting long-term illness		2001: 14.7%	14.10%	16.20%	18.20%	There were fewer working age people with a long-term illness in Hertsmere			2001 Census
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 had 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/acccdata/
Properties affected by flood risk		n/k	n/k	125,000	approx 2 million				www.eelgc.gov.uk
Deaths per 1000 population as a result of	a.) Coronary heart disease	n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k	Figures indicate a slight decline though longer time series needed to reliably discern trends			www.sustainable-development.gov.uk
	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				

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	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				
Resident perceptions of town centres		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
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
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 remained consistent / stable in all of the Borough's main centres with the exception of Radlett where the number of vacancies had fallen and the district centre was 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				
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
Retail floorspace in centre vs. out-of-centre	% of retail floorspace in:					The Borough's retail floorspace remains was 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		HBC Retail Surveys
	a.) Town Centres	2005: 81	n/k	n/k	n/k				

Indicator	Description	Hertsmere	Herts	East of England	National	Issue Identified	Targets	SEA Topic	Data Source
	b.) Edge of Town locations	2005: 2	n/k	n/k	n/k		locations to not exceed the 2005 baseline.		
	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				
% of land or highways that are of an unacceptable standard of cleanliness		2005: 12	n/k	n/k	n/k		30%		Waste Services (BV199)
% of Borough deficient in various types of open space, as per needs survey		n/k	n/k	n/k	n/k				
% 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
	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 improve the quality and affordability of	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 in rural areas. However, there is a risk that rural sites may be more attractive to	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
housing										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 both geographically and demographically	+	In focusing development in the more accessible 'main' towns, the policy option may help to improve access to health care facilities, sporting and leisure provision for a wider range of the population.	+/-	The removal of the hierarchy may result in a more equitable pattern of development, potentially including 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.	++	In directing development to a wider range of accessible locations, the policy option should contribute to improved levels of access to health care, sporting and leisure provision for a wide section of the community.	--	The market led approach is unlikely to deliver provision in the areas of greatest need, thus there is a risk that health inequalities may be deepened.	+/- -	The opportunity to develop a new rural settlement (s) may result in the addition of some community based facilities including sporting and leisure provision; however, there is a risk that additional residential development will not be supported by the	+	In focusing development in the more accessible 'main' towns, the policy option may help to improve access to health care facilities, sporting and leisure provision for a wider range of the population.

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
										transportation network, which could limit the spread of benefits and restrict access to primary healthcare.		
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 allow 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 before greenfield sites and thus no potential loss of valuable soil resources.	+	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 may be reduced.	++	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 before greenfield sites and thus no potential loss of valuable soil resources.
9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and	+	Identification of a development hierarchy presents opportunities to continue with a spatial policy to direct development to the main towns in Hertsmere, potentially	+/-	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	+	This option would produce similar positive effects to option 1 as it is likely that development will still be focused in Borehamwood and	-	This policy option will result in an unstructured approach with no control over spatial distribution of development potentially to the	--	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	+/-	Substantial urban intensification directed to the main towns in Hertsmere, may potentially assist in the protection and enhancement of historic buildings.

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
cultural features of importance to the community		assisting in the protection and enhancement of historic buildings.		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.		Potters Bar due to these areas having high levels of accessibility.		detriment historic buildings and features through impacts on local character resulting in harm to the setting of historic assets through unsympathetic development.		mitigation.		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 modal shift to more sustainable transport modes	++	Focussing development in main towns is likely to make the best use of existing sustainable transport infrastructure.	-	Dispersed development would be contrary to the development of a sustainable transport system and would lead to growth in car usage and congestion.	+++	Accessibility based approach allows flexibility to consider the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and could allow for significant levels of modal shift across the District.	--	Unrestricted growth is likely to lead to greater use of the private car and associated congestion problems.	--	Rural expansion is likely to lead to greater use of the car and traffic congestion, particularly in areas that currently may not suffer from congestion problems.	+++	Focussing high density development in main towns is likely to make the best use 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	-	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	-	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	--	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	--	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

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
		two main towns.		main settlements in Hertsmere.		two main towns.				development with this option is higher.		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 flooding taking account of climate change	-	Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk.	-	Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk.	-	Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk.	-	Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk.	-	Potential negative effects as additional development would result in increased runoff and a potential increase in flood risk.	--	Potential negative effects as additional 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	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11+16.	-	See assessment of SA objective 11+16.	++/-	See assessment of SA objective 11+16.	-	See assessment of SA objective 11+16.	--	See assessment of SA objective 11+16.	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11+16.

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
gas emissions		Sustainable transport usage in main towns will minimise greenhouse gas emissions, although any development will increase greenhouse gas emissions unless carbon neutral.		Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions. Although any development will increase greenhouse gas emissions unless carbon neutral.		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.		Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions.		Vehicle use is likely to increase with negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions.		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 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	+/-	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	++/-	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	++	In focusing development in the most accessible locations, the policy option presents the opportunity to create a more balanced economy served by effective transport	+/- -	The market approach is essentially economically driven and thus represents the potential to maximise economic benefits in certain locations. However,	+/-	Development in rural areas may help to better support the rural economy through increased availability of sites for both employment and residential development.	++/- -	In focusing development in the main towns, there is the opportunity to improve the economy of these centres; however, the substantial urban intensification does

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
		economy across the District.		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.		infrastructure.		the nature of market led growth is likely to lead to greater imbalances between settlements and thus undermine the objective.		However, dispersed patterns of development are likely to have increased pressure on rural services may have adverse effects on economic stability of smaller centres.		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 expense of the smaller towns in the District.	+/-	This policy option would result in development within a wider range of settlements across the District – although this may have localised benefits, such an approach may not be supported by the necessary infrastructure, which could undermine the ability of town centres to remain vital and viable.	++	In focusing development in a range of the most accessible town centres, this policy approach should help to support the vitality and viability of these more accessible areas.	+/- -	The market approach is essentially economically driven and thus while it may result in considerably increased vitality and viability in certain towns; this is likely to be tempered with greater inequality and decline of other centres in the District.	--	Rural expansion is likely to draw population away from town and service centres, creating a more dispersed development pattern. However, these 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.	++/- -	In focusing development on the main settlements, the policy option should have significant benefits for these towns; however this may be at the 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 theme 8.	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 affordable housing secured.

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
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 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	++	Release of existing employment areas will allow them to be used for other uses such as housing preventing development on Greenfield sites for	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 of effect dependent on demand for housing sites.	+	A spatial control over the location of employment may contribute to making the most efficient use of PDL over Greenfield release.	+/-	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.	0	With no policy intervention, it is unlikely that employment will be met on previously developed land due to higher land values for other uses such

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
Greenfield sites		this use.								However, this option may result in Greenfield release for employment use thus conflicting with this objective.		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 employment sites for housing may enhance the quality of the local	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 employment sites for housing may enhance the quality of the local

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
		landscape.										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 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	--	Potential for negative effects as land may	-	Similar effect to Option 1 – although	0	Is likely to have no obvious effect over the	+	By controlling the location of	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Potential	--	With no protection employment sites

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
		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.		effect not likely to be as significant due to retention of designated sites with the policy option.		current baseline.		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.		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.		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 energy	-	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.
19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-	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
use and recycling of waste												
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, over time, competing development pressure is likely to lead to employment loss. Without business activity in town centres, vitality	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 location is determined in a manner that will maximise complementary benefits for town centre vitality and viability.	+	The release of constrained employment sites within town centre 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.	--	Without policy intervention, it is likely that employment uses within town centres will be amongst those lost to higher value development, with corresponding detrimental effects for town centre vitality and viability, potentially creating dormant villages.

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
		and viability are likely to be compromised.										

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

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.

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
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 efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites	+	While current green belt boundaries are maintained development will be constrained to previously developed land.	-	Growth targets are likely to push development into Greenfield sites as previously developed sites are exhausted.	++	Extending green belt is likely to force further development to take place on previously developed land and buildings.	--	Without protection from policy, green 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	+	Protection will be maintained with this option while boundaries	-	Risk of some negative effects to local biodiversity if review leads to	++	Extension of green belt will afford further protection to	--	Without protection from policy, green belt could be considered for

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
enhance wildlife and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale		remain the same.		development in green belt in response to growth.		biodiversity sites and important flora and fauna found in Greenfield locations.		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.
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

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
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 centres	+	Protection of the green belt 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 review approach is likely to result in a reduction of green belt arising from development pressure. This 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.	++	Extension of the green belt is likely to result in much greater densities of development within the existing settlements. Increased population in locations more accessible to existing settlements should help to support town centre vitality and viability.	--	No policy intervention is likely to result in widespread loss of greenfield land to development 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 led / 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	++	This option offers the opportunity to ensure that sites for gypsies are well	+	This option offers opportunity to include access to essential	++	This option offers the opportunity to allocate sites for gypsies that are well	+/-	Under this policy option there is a requirement to provide evidence of need. This will not	--	This policy option is likely to give rise to one of two eventualities – either

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
services and facilities for all residents		related to essential services and facilities, which would meet objective for this section of the population.		services and facilities as one of the assessment criteria for future site identification, which would meet objective for this section of the population.		related to essential services and facilities for this section of the population, to a greater extent than option 1.		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.		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 value development and thus gypsies will be excluded.	++	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 suitable sites will be justified/released.	--	In failing to recognise the housing needs of gypsies, this policy fails to meet the objective.
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	+/- -	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	--	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

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
				has the potential to reduce fear of crime through ensuring sites are properly planned and managed,		criminal damage as encampments are set up on unauthorised sites, pending planning decisions.		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.
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.

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 led / do nothing.	
SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
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 chosen away from settlement areas, this option may have a detrimental effect on local landscape.	+/-	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 away from settlement areas, this option may have a detrimental effect on local landscape.	++	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 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	+	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.

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 led / do nothing.	
SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
local scale										
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.
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	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
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.
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 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 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	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	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	SE	Comments/ explanation
employability												
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 quality and affordability of housing	---	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 housing needs to 2021.	++	In allocating sufficient housing sites to meet the regional target, the policy option should assist in enabling identified housing needs to be met.	++/-	In allocating sufficient housing sites to exceed the regional target, the policy option should provide a choice of sites 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.	---	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.	--	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 needs for affordable housing.
4. To reduce	--	In allocating housing land	--	In allocating insufficient	++	Allocating	+++	Allocating a larger	---	Without policy	---	In linking housing

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
poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities		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.		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.		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.		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.		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.		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 behaviour	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effect.
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	--	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

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
										option.		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 land 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 resulting in overall negative effects.	--	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 certain less desirable areas in favour of more desirable greenfield sites.	+/-	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 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,	+	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	+/-	Relatively high target build rate which may increase pressure to build in	--	Ambitious build rate likely to require considerable number of development sites, increasing likelihood of	-	Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to result in some level of	+/-	Relatively high target build rate which may increase pressure to build in proximity to heritage

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
historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community				which can have negative effects on historic structures.		proximity to heritage assets thus having detrimental effects on local character through potentially unsympathetic design.		detrimental effects upon heritage assets across the District.		house building however, with not policy this may result in negative effects on heritage assets depending on the location attracted by market forces.		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 seek more desirable greenfield sites.	--	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.
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	+/-	Brownfield sites and urban infill sites may be important for local biodiversity. However,	+	Reducing the build rate target is likely to result in less pressure for intensifying development	--	This option is likely to involve greenfield expansion which,	---	This option is likely to involve greenfield expansion which, dependent on location,	--	Without policy intervention, market forces are likely to result in	--	This option is likely to involve greenfield expansion which, dependent on

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
which are important on an international, national and local scale		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		in settlement areas therefore less pressure to develop sites important for local biodiversity such as brownfield land.		dependent on location, could be important for local biodiversity.		could be important for local biodiversity, to a greater extent than option 3.		some level of house building however, there is no control over location which could result negative effects on areas important for local biodiversity.		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 is stretched	-	Housing may exceed targets with detrimental effect on water consumption	0	No obvious effect.
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	+/-	Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the	+/-	Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the	+/-	Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas	+/-	Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas emissions. However the	+/-	Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas	+/-	Any development of housing will contribute to greenhouse gas

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
emissions		scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction		scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction		emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction		scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction		emissions. However the scale of effect would be dependent on design and construction		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 the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste	+/-	Opportunity to reduce per capita waste generation 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.	+/-	Less opportunity to reduce per capita waste generation through design however, less waste generated with less homes built per annum.	++/-	Opportunity to reduce per capita 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.	++/-	Opportunity to reduce per capita 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.	0	No obvious effect.	0	No obvious effects.
ECONOMIC												
20. To provide	--	Provision of homes for	--	Provision of homes for	++	Provision of	+/-	Provision of homes for	--	In relying on the	++/-	Provision of homes

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
a prosperous, balanced and stable economy		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.		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.		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.		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.		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 local economy.	-	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 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	+++	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	++/-	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,	--	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	--	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

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
				Option 1.		frequent use of town centres for essential services and facilities, as well as recreation.		there is a risk that high development targets may have detrimental effects on town centres arising from 'cramming' of development.		development would be likely to have detrimental effects.		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

	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
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.

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
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 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	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
features of importance to the community										
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 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	+	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	+	See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport use	0	See assessment of SA objective 11. No obvious effects.	+	See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport use being	+	See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Sustainable transport use being	--	See assessment of SA objective 11+16. Greenhouse gas

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
emissions		being maintained or increased will contribute towards decreased greenhouse gas emissions.				maintained or increased will contribute towards decreased greenhouse gas emissions.		maintained or increased will contribute towards decreased greenhouse gas emissions.		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 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	++	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	+/-	Effects would be dependent on the lifetime of the policy. Extension could	-	Release of safeguarded areas would reduce the need to develop on previously developed land and	+/-	Termination of safeguarded land may provide more land for housing, prevent this from occurring in Greenfield land

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
land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites		protect Greenfield sites.		could endanger Greenfield sites.		but Greenfield land protected by safeguarding could suffer.
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	-	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
		quality.				
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 prevent crime,	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
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 landscape	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.
11. To reduce	+	Those on lower income	+	Those on lower income	+	Those on lower income such	+	Those on lower income such as	-	Those on lower income

	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
dependence on private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes		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		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		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		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		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 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

	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
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
		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
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	--	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

	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
				access 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 renewable energy	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
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	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
residents										
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.
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	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
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.	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	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	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
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	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 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	+	Availability of housing for the full	++	Availability of housing for the full demographic	++	Availability of housing for the full demographic	++/- -	Availability of housing for the full demographic range,	--	Availability of housing for the full demographic

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
prosperous, balanced and stable economy		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.		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.		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.		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.		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 demographic diversity, which is important in supporting vitality and viability.	++	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 supporting vitality and viability.	++	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 supporting vitality and viability.	++/- -	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 market demand changes, there is a risk that town centres may suffer decline as population out-migrates.	--	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.

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

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
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 and safeguard soil quality and quantity	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	-	New development may cause contamination or soil disturbance.	-	New development may cause contamination or soil disturbance.
9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological	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 (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
sites and cultural features of importance to the community								
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 emissions	0	No obvious effects.	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Greenhouse gas emissions are related to the related increase in vehicle emissions.	+/-	Provision of needed services may reduce the need to travel. However future housing may be built further away and increase travel	+/-	Use of land for services or facilities may reduce the need to. 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.

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
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	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

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
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.
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 and quantity	-	Rural exceptions may result in slight negative effects through Greenfield development and the loss of agricultural land.	0	No obvious effects.	--	Rural exceptions across the Borough are likely to have significant negative effects through potential Greenfield development and 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.

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
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 energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable energy	+	Opportunity for low energy building design and renewable energy provision with new developments in rural areas.	0	No obvious effects.	+	Opportunity for low energy building design and renewable energy 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 impaired. This may have some	++	The policy option should help to ensure that an increased amount of homes meet the needs of certain disadvantaged groups, such as the mobility impaired. This is likely to have	--	This policy option offers little or no opportunity to secure the delivery of housing that meets the specialist needs of certain sectors of the	+/-	This policy option may help to secure greater inclusiveness for wheelchair bound persons; however, it does not cater for other often excluded groups (e.g.	++/-	This policy option may help to secure greater inclusiveness for wheelchair bound persons on the basis of need; however, it does not cater for other often excluded	---	Reliance on the market is unlikely to deliver homes that serve to meet specific needs and may therefore serve to deepen social exclusion and inequality of

	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
		benefits in terms of increasing equality of opportunity and reducing social exclusion.		some benefits in terms of increasing equality of opportunity and reducing social exclusion.		population. As such, it is likely to increase social exclusion and perpetuate inequalities.		the visually impaired) and thus may serve to perpetuate inequalities.		groups (e.g. the visually impaired) and thus may serve to perpetuate inequalities.		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 services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a	++	Better provision of lifetime homes in all settlements will allow those with disabilities/ mobility problems to live in settlements with best services and facilities for their needs. This could lead to a	-	Reduced provision of lifetime homes would not allow those with disabilities/ mobility problems to live in settlements with best services and	++	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	-	Without policy those with disabilities/ mobility problems will not be able to live in settlements with best services and facilities for their needs. This could

	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
		reduction in the need to travel.		reduction in the need to travel. Effect likely to be greater than option 1.		facilities for their needs. This could lead to an increase in the need to travel.		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.		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 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel.	+	See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel.	-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible increase in the need to travel.	+	See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel.	+	See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible reduction in the need to travel.	-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Possible increase in the need to travel.

	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
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	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

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
access to essential services and facilities for all residents								
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 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	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

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 and quantity	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
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.
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.

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
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 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 greenhouse gas emissions through better energy efficiency and use of sustainable materials. Scale of positive effect depends on the status of the HCC Guide and the ability to enforce its requirements.	++	Requirements may help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in larger developments and policy may benefit from economies of scale on larger development sites.	+/-	National government policy will help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but has no local focus.
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.

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
		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)
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	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
		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
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	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
facilities for all residents										
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 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	+++	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	--	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.

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
before Greenfield sites										
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 of countryside and landscape	++	No development in the floodplain may indirectly allow the protection of the landscape in floodplain areas.	+	No development in the floodplain may indirectly allow the protection of the landscape in floodplain areas.	-	Flood prevention measures, depending on nature may have negative effects on local landscape.	0	No obvious effects.	--	No policy intervention to restrict development in 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	+	Preventing development in flood	+	Preventing inappropriate development in flood	+	Use of systems such as SUDS and permeable surfaces would	+	Some beneficial effects, although option does not	-	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
quality of surface and ground waters		plains will prevent/reduce the risk of surface and groundwater pollution during flooding.		plains will prevent/reduce the risk of surface and groundwater pollution during flooding		introduce and extra stage of filtering, reducing surface and groundwater pollution.		provide strong policy basis.		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 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	+++	Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local	+++	Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies.	++	Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies. Adopting a whole	+	Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local economies.	--	Flooding can have significant adverse effects for local

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
stable economy		economies. Safeguarding against flood risk should indirectly help to support the objective.		Safeguarding against flood risk should indirectly help to support the objective.		catchment approach to the reduction of flood risk should help to support the objective, albeit indirectly.		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.		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

	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
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,	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	--	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.

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
				accessible to community members.						objective.		
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.
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,	+	'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are	+	'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often	0	No effect – the policy option is	++	'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are	-	'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often	--	'Boredom' or a 'lack of things to do' are often

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
fear of crime and anti social behaviour		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.		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.		concerned with health care provision as opposed to leisure facilities.		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.		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.		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 health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically	0	No effect – maintaining existing provision is unlikely to improve health over the current baseline.	+	The policy option includes a mechanism for additional community facilities, which may include health care and additional sporting/leisure opportunities.	+++	The policy option supports the targeted delivery of primary health care services in areas of demonstrable need. This should have beneficial effects.	++	The policy option includes a mechanism for the pro-active provision of additional facilities, which may include health care, sporting and leisure opportunities.	-	The policy option supports the rationalisation of 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.	--	Without policy intervention, there is no mechanism for 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	-	May result in inefficient use of land and buildings with a strict policy resisting the loss of all community facilities if they are	+	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	++	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	0	No obvious effect.

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
before Greenfield sites		underused due to being in the wrong location.				objective.				loss of community facilities, may be left redundant representing an inefficient use of land and buildings.		
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 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 unsympathetic design.	--	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.
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	++	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.

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
						accessibility.						
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. 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	-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Additional vehicle use likely to increase	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Effect on greenhouse gas	+	See assessment of SA objective 11. Support for sustainable locations	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Effect on greenhouse gas emissions dependent	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
		emissions are likely to be maintained or potentially reduced through continued use of sustainable locations.		greenhouse gas emissions.		emissions dependent on levels of additional vehicle usage.		likely to maintain or potentially reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To be truly carbon neutral new developments should be required to be carbon neutral.		on levels of additional vehicle usage.		
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 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 housing	++	The policy option includes provision to seek developer contributions/commuted payments for the provision of affordable housing, which should contribute to the objective.	++	The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the tariff approach could be used as a means of requiring	++	The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the tariff approach could be used as a means of requiring	+	The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the unilateral approach could be used as a means of requiring	++	The policy option does not make specific reference to affordable housing, although the tariff approach could be used as a means of requiring developers	---	Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help secure affordable housing provision 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
				developers to incorporate provision.		developers to incorporate provision.		developers to incorporate provision. Unilaterals offer less certainty than tariffs/s106.		to incorporate provision.		
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.
ENVIRONMENTAL												
7. To make the most efficient	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
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.	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	+	Contributions towards sustainable transport are possible under the present policy but are limited to those services affected as a result of the development.	+++	A tariff based approach is likely to generate sufficient funding to enhance sustainable transport options across the District.	++	Similar effect to option 2, however the effect will be of a smaller magnitude as levels of funding for sustainable transport provision will not be as large.	+/-	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 sustainable transport provision.	+++	Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for sustainable transport provision. Presumably this	--	Without policy intervention, the opportunity to use developers to help invest in public transport provision is lost.

	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
										would reflect the scale of development.		
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 of climate change	+	Contributions towards improvements to flood defences are possible under the present policy but are limited to areas affected as a result of the development.	+++	Tariff based approach is likely to fund flood defence 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 flood defences.	+++	Policy option offers opportunity to ensure that all applicants make financial contributions, which could provide funds for flood defences. Presumably this would reflect the	--	Opportunity to improve flood defences through development would be 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
										scale of development		
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 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-	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
use and recycling of waste												
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

	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
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 efficient use of	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

	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
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 attracted 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.
14. To minimise water consumption	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
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.
6. To improve population's health	++	Active management of and increased access to	+++	Active management, increased access and a greater amount	++	Increased access to the countryside and linkages	--	A restrictive approach that limits recreational	---	Without policy intervention to protect countryside for

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
and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically		the countryside is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits.		of countryside are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through significantly increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits across a broader area of the Borough.		to urban areas are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits.		access into and use of the countryside is likely to constrain opportunities for active leisure pursuits, with potentially detrimental effects for health.		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.
11. To reduce dependence on private car and	+	Protection of rights of way allow the community to walk to facilities and services rather than	+/-	Increasing provision may cause more people to walk to services and facilities. However more people may	++	Increasing access to greenways and improving links from urban areas will have a significant positive	-	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

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
achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes		relying on private car use		travel, by car to gateway sites		effect on encouraging sustainable modes of transport.				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 sites may increase traffic, increasing greenhouse gas emissions.	+	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.
18. To minimise the need for energy,	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.			0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

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
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.	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 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.
6. To improve	++	Active management of	+++	Active management, increased	++	Increased access to the	--	A restrictive approach	---	Without policy intervention to

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
population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically		and increased access to the countryside is likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits.		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.		countryside and linkages to urban areas are likely to encourage healthier lifestyles through increased opportunities for active leisure pursuits.		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.		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.
11. To reduce dependence on	+	Protection of rights of way allow the community to walk to facilities and	+/-	Increasing provision may cause more people to walk to services and facilities.	++	Increasing access to greenways and improving links from urban areas will	-	Restriction use may cause more travel in private cars to services	-	Removing protection of rights of way may cause development to occur,

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
private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes		services rather than relying on private car use		However more people may travel, by car to gateway sites		have a significant positive effect on encouraging sustainable modes of transport.		and facilities		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 sites may increase traffic, increasing greenhouse gas emissions.	+	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.
18. To minimise the	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.			0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

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
need for 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.	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

	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
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 crime, fear of crime and anti social	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
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.
11. To reduce dependence on private car and	++	Policy option likely to have a significant positive effect by introducing a range of policy measures to encourage the use of	+/-	Potential for positive and negative effects. Although improvements could be achieved by the range of policy measures included in	+	Whilst the existing policy does promote the use of sustainable modes of transport where possible, the policy does not	+/-	Policy option could lead to increased use of sustainable modes of transport through the lack of parking provision on-site. However, the policy could

	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
achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes		sustainable modes of transport.		Option 1, these could be undermined by schemes catering for car ownership presumed through this policy.		provide certainty in encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. Scale of effect likely to be less than option 1.		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 reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Reductions in greenhouse gas emissions through increased use of sustainable modes of transport could be offset by increased vehicle use.	+	See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Increased use of sustainable modes of transport is likely to have a positive effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.	+/-	See assessment of SA objective 11 and 16. Reductions in greenhouse gas emissions could be offset by increased congestion and emissions.
18. To minimise the need for energy, increase	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
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.	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 and safeguard soil quality	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 and quantity	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
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 energy, increase energy efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable	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						
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	++	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

	Option 1 – Base on Existing Policy		Option 2 – do nothing	
SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
demographically				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 and landscape	+	Protection of allotments will contribute to maintaining the landscape	-	Loss of allotments through a do nothing approach would allow 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.

		Option 1 – Base on Existing Policy		Option 2 – do nothing	
SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE
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
19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling of waste	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0
ECONOMIC					
20. To provide a prosperous, balanced and stable economy	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0
21. To sustain and enhance the viability and vitality of town centres	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0

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

		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	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.
and employability										
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 opportunities	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect
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	++	The policy option incorporates measures to minimise the environmental effects of development including reductions in emissions and reduced ambient pollution. Following implementation, such	++	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.	+	The policy option seeks to adopt a whole life approach to building design, creating 'healthier' buildings through the use of renewable energy	+	Environmental protection can have health benefits in terms of reduced emissions and improved water quality. The policy option proposes a multi-policy approach to	+	Regional guidance includes some environmental protection, which is important in safeguarding health. However, the effects are likely to be least

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.
demographically		measures should help to improve health, particularly in terms of respiratory disorders, although potentially to a lesser degree than Option 2.		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.		sources and sustainable design. However, beneficial health effects may be limited by lack of direct requirement to cut carbon emissions.		implementation – this limits the scope of policy influence; however health benefits are likely.		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 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	+/-	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	++	The protection of air, water and soil quality resources from	0	Benefits to local landscape and countryside quality	+	The protection of air quality resources from	0	No clear direct policy and as such, the extent	+	The protection of air, water and soil quality

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
quality of countryside and landscape		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.		unclear with this option.		pollution risk is likely to have secondary effects on local landscape quality.		of the knock on effects are unknown.		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 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	++	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.

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.
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 consumption	+	Policy likely to result in reduction in water consumption in new development. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets.	++	Policy likely to have a 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.	0	Policy option does not address water consumption.	0	Current policies do not directly address water consumption.	-	Policy option unlikely to 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	++	Policy option likely to reduce emissions from buildings from boilers etc. Policy option could be	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	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
		lack of targets.		strengthened by referring to BREEAM standards (see above).				certainty.		
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 efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable 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. Policy provides no assurance on uptake of renewable energy as energy efficiency improvements may reduce carbon emissions by 10% alone.	0	Policy does not directly address energy efficiency.	+	Reliance on national and regional guidance such as PPG25, PPS25, 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	+++	Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business investment.	+++	As Option 1. In exceeding national targets in respect of emissions, the policy option	++	Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business	+	Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business	+	Environmental quality is important in attracting and retaining business

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
stable economy		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.		may help to create a unique selling point, which may be further beneficial to the local economy.		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.		investment. In safeguarding environmental quality, the policy option should help to support the objective.		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 vitality of town centres	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect

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

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.

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
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 opportunities	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect
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

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.
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 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,	+/-	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	+/-	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	+/-	Potential negative effects on the setting of historic buildings through provision of renewable energy schemes. Reduced levels of air,	0	No change from existing.	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
		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.
archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community		protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes.		protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes.		soil and water pollution may contribute to the protection of heritage assets, particularly landscapes.				
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 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	++	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	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

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

SA/SEA Objective		SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
			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.								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 consumption		+	Policy likely to result in reduction in water consumption in new development. However the level of certainty is low given the lack of targets.	++	Policy likely to have a 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.	0	Policy option does not address water consumption.	0	Current policies do not directly address water consumption.	-	Policy option unlikely to result in reductions in water consumption.
15. To minimise the risk of flooding taking account of		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.

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
climate change										
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 efficiency, and to increase the use of renewable 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. Policy provides no assurance on uptake of renewable energy as energy efficiency improvements may reduce carbon emissions by 10% alone.	0	Policy does not directly address energy efficiency.	+	Reliance on national and regional guidance such as PPG25, PPS25, PPS22, PPS23.
19. To reduce the generation of waste and encourage re-use 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

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
recycling of waste										
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 vitality of town centres	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect

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 social behaviour	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.
6. To improve	+/-	Playing fields play a crucial role in	-	The release of playing fields for	+	This policy option seeks to retain	--	Without policy intervention, it is likely

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
population's health and reduce inequalities both geographically and demographically		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.		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.		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.		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 employment land.	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
11. To reduce dependence on	+/-	Use of land for development may reduce the need to travel by car or at all for housing and employment	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

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
private car and achieve modal shift to more sustainable transport modes		needs. However it may increase the need to travel for playing fields or general recreation.						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 increase greenhouse gas emission. 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 increase greenhouse gas emission. 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 increase greenhouse gas emission. In the short term any development will increase levels of dust.
18. To minimise the	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
need for 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.	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

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.
--	--	---	--	---	---

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

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 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
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,	+/-	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.

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
						potentially to meet identified housing needs.						
4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and promote equality of opportunities	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect	0	No effect
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	--	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

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
										effects for health.		development, with potentially adverse effects for health.
ENVIRONMENTAL												
7. To make the most efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites	--	Potential negative 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.	-	Having a cap of 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.	-	Maintaining 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.	-/+	Maintaining 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.	-/+	Maintaining 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.	+	Relying on 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	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
quantity												
9. To protect and enhance landscape character, historic buildings, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community	++	This option ensures that redevelopment respects and reflects the overall character and as such, it will be highly complementary with this objective in protecting the character of historic assets and their settings.	+/-	A cap of intensification is assessed as having a mix of negative effects, negative until the cap is reached, then positive effects as the character will be protected.	-	No reference to protecting or having regard to the valued and recognised character of the surroundings of historic buildings.	-	No reference to protecting or having regard to the valued and recognised character of the surroundings townscape of historic buildings.	+	Some protection for having regard to the valued and recognised character in existing local plan policies.	--	No reference to protecting or having regard to the valued and 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 /	++	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	+	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
				sustainable modes of transport.		transport.						
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	-	See assessment of SA objective 11. Increased	-	See assessment of SA objective	++	See assessment of SA objective 11.	+	See assessment of SA objective	-	See assessment of SA objective 11.	--	See assessment of SA objective

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
quality		car use may result in degraded local air quality.		11. Increased car use may result in degraded local air quality.		Greater use of sustainable modes of transport, and consequently less use of the private car is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality.		11. Greater use of sustainable modes of transport, and consequently less use of the private car is likely to have a positive effect on improving local air quality.		Increased car use may result in degraded local air quality.		11. Increased car use may result in 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) within and	+	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 application of the	++/-	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 reliance on high

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
						accessible to town centres across the Borough.				policy principles, which could undermine their effectiveness.		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

SA/SEA Objective	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation	SE	Comments/ explanation
		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
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.

	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
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 potential for loss of valuable soil resources to mineral development.	+/- -	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 potential for loss of valuable soil resources to mineral development.	-	Without protection of minerals, development could occur, disturbing the soil and effecting quality and quantity
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	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

	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
transport modes						
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 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 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

	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
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

	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
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	0	No obvious effects.

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
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, archaeological sites and cultural features of importance to the community	+	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
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

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

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
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 and encourage re-use and recycling of waste	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	--	Without protection, development could 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.

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
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 efficient use of previously land developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites	+	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 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	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 – 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
the quality of countryside and landscape						
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 effects.	+	Current areas of urban open land act as a buffer to flood risk.
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	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.

	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
re-use and recycling of waste						
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.

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
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 previously developed land and existing buildings before Greenfield sites	0	No obvious effects.	+	Option may encourage further development in town centre locations. Scale of effect dependent on scale of buffer zone and proximity to developed location.	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.
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	0	No obvious effects.	0	No obvious effects.	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
community								
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.
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.

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
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 scale of the buffer zone and potential development sites affected.	++	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.
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.

