

South Norfolk Gypsy and Traveller DPD – Sustainability Appraisal of Options

OPTION C:		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect sites of nature conservation value from inappropriate development? • Will it increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? • Will it bring negative effects to designated sites and what would this involve? • Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest? • Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to influence Biodiversity Action Plan progress and protect SSSIs • Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value 			Sensitive sites may be at risk from unauthorised development.
		-	?	?	
ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it minimise the risk of flooding? • Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns? • Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones? • Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones • Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones 			Travellers are unlikely to select flood-risk sites
		0	0	0	
ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it encourage efficient use of energy? • Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development? • Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from traffic? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes • Reducing household energy use and increasing use of energy from renewable sources 			Unauthorised development is unlikely to be influenced by energy minimisation considerations
		-	-	-	

OPTION C		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce traffic volume? • Will it reduce traffic congestion? • Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment? • Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % residential development complying with car-parking standards • Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport 			Unauthorised development poses a higher risk of local adverse effects than other options, and mitigation will rarely be practicable. Although short-term on each site, problems will recur across the District
		-	-	-	
ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution? • Can it improve the ambiance of local areas? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 and ozone pollution • Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas 			Unauthorised development poses a higher risk of local adverse effects than other options, and mitigation will rarely be practicable. Although short-term on each site, problems will recur across the District.
		-	-	-	
ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect vulnerable and valued landscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development? • Will it ensure that building design makes a positive contribution to the local area, and enhances the character of local landscapes? • Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land? • Will the District’s heritage be preserved or enhanced? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments considered ‘at risk’ • Conservation Area management plans 			Risk of continued unauthorised development, with little possibility of mitigation or high standards of design.
		-	-	-	

OPTION C		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land? • Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of new dwellings built on previously developed land • New dwellings densities and land use efficiency • Contaminated land: its availability and restrictions to new development 			Unauthorised development as likely on greenfield as on brownfield sites. Adverse effects of option C will be short-term, reversible, and not significant
		0	0	0	
ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems? • Will it reduce water consumption? • Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice • Groundwater resource availability across the District 			Requires significant investment, so unlikely on unauthorised developments, which have an uncertain future.
		-	-	-	
ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal? • Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head • Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted 			Temporary nature of use makes positive arrangements unlikely. Cost of “clear-up” after enforcement to remove use.
		-	-	-	
Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives		-	-	-	Option C has an overall negative impact

OPTION C		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce homelessness? • Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions • Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings 			Under option C, Gypsy and Travellers will face severe adverse effects and continued harassment.
		--	--	--	
S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected? • Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District? • Will it support the development of Social Cohesion? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country • Reducing the numbers of people claiming Job Seekers Allowance 			Option C will do nothing to improve prospects and access to facilities for Gypsies and Travellers. Risk of continued friction with settled communities.
		--	--	--	
S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce unemployment overall? • Will it improve earnings? • Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of the population of working age in employment • Improving the level of average earnings 			Much of Gypsy and Traveller economic activity is adapted to lack of permanent sites. Option C may disadvantage those wishing to adopt a settled lifestyle in the longer term.
		0	0	-	

OPTION C		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
SOCIAL FACTORS		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need					
Decision-making criteria • Will it improve accessibility to key local services?		Indicator-based concerns • Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities • Improving the level of facilities in local areas for local people to access			
		-	-	-	Unauthorised sites tend to be more remote from services
S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall					
Decision-making criteria • Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people? • Will it improve access to schools / education facilities? • Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?		Indicator-based concerns • Improving the level of school exam performance • Improving the vocational training amongst the working population			
		--	--	--	Will not assist regular school attendance. Likely severe adverse effects for Gypsy and Traveller community. Unable to plan school capacity to meet demand, impact on local schools near unauthorised sites may adversely affect standard of educational provision for all communities.
S6: To improve the health of the population overall					
Decision-making criteria • Will it reduce death rates? • Will it improve access to high quality health facilities? • Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?		Indicator-based concerns • Ability to access GP services within 2 working days • Improving the general life expectancy at birth			
		--	--	--	Will not assist access to health facilities, nor improve poorer health levels among Gypsy and Traveller communities, compared to settled communities

OPTION C		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime? • Will it encourage engagement in community activities? 		Indicator-based concerns			Option C is likely to result in continued mutual suspicion and mistrust between travelling and settled communities
		-	-	-	
S8: To improve the quality of where people live					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods? Will it increase access to and provision of quality open space?		Indicator-based concerns			Higher risk of continued sporadic occupation of open space by unauthorised uses, compared to other options. Some Gypsies and Travellers will have to occupy unsatisfactory sites which lack proper facilities. Lack of planned solutions will continue low-level dissatisfaction among settled community, in areas affected
		--	--	--	
Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives		--	--	--	Option C has overall, strong negative impact

OPTION 5		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
ECONOMIC FACTORS		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)? • Will it help retain existing businesses? • Will it aid farming diversification? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving floor space used for economic uses, especially in regeneration areas • Facilitation more VAT registered businesses in the District, eg. by providing land 			
		0	0	0	Will not meet any of these criteria, but overall small impact
EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses? • Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises? • Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessing the availability of employment land across the District 			
		0	0	0	Will not meet any of these criteria, but overall small impact
EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it encourage the development of local employment locations? • Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work? • Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses? • Will it encourage mixed use or live / work? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travel-to-work by mode data • Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car 			
		0	0	0	Will not meet any of these criteria, but overall small impact

OPTION C		“Do nothing”			
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria	Assessing the impacts (++ / - - / 0 / ?)			Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures
ECONOMIC FACTORS		Short term	Medium term	Long term	
EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working? Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging business to work towards gaining Investors in People accreditation Amount of floor space developed by employment type on previously developed land 			
		-	-	-	Unplanned, so impact on the environment cannot be controlled
EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas					
Decision-making criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage rural diversification? Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas? Will it improve electronic communication potential? 		Indicator-based concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns Improving the ‘jobs density’, as number of jobs to every resident of working age 			
		-	-	-	Continuation of unauthorised sites under option C means that Gypsy and Traveller communities are unlikely to broaden their traditional pattern of economic activity, and may have limited opportunity to access fixed electronic communications.
Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives		0	0	0	Option C is unlikely to have a significant effect on this criterion as many of the Gypsy and Traveller community are traditionally self-employed or rely on seasonal, casual or migrant employment. Some sites may also include an element of employment use within them.
Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect					
Overall Conclusions: Option C: Environmental overall negative impact, Social strong negative impact, Economic overall neutral impact.					
Recommendations for Policy:					