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Non-Technical Summary

Background

0.1 The Wymondham Area Action Plan (AAP) forms part of the South Norfolk Local Plan and sets out chosen sites for the development and use of land within the Wymondham AAP area. The Local Plan is being produced in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Localism Act 2011.

0.2 European Directive 2001/42/EC requires the identification and evaluation of the environmental impacts of certain plans through a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), the aim of which is to ensure that a high level of protection is given to the environment. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) extends the requirements of the European Directive by requiring the preparation of Sustainability Appraisal reports to also take into consideration social and economic concerns. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement of plan making and South Norfolk Council has therefore prepared a SA Report for the Wymondham AAP in accordance with European Directive 2001/42/EC.

0.3 The preparation of the SA has been an iterative process to support the preparation of the plan and has also followed guidance in the DCLG Plan Making Manual (2010).


0.4 A SA Scoping Report was initially prepared in summer 2010, to cover all the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents together (the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Wymondham AAP, the Long Stratton AAP and the Development Management Policies Document).

0.5 The SA Scoping Report includes a review of all relevant plans, programmes and policies (updated in this draft SA), provides a baseline for key environmental, social and economic data, and identifies issues and problems which need to be addressed through the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents. Finally, the scoping report also provides a framework and set of objectives for the assessment of all policies and reasonable alternatives within the main document.

0.6 The SA Scoping Report was consulted upon widely with both statutory consultees and a number of other organisations. The 2010 consultation on the scoping report provided useful feedback on the key environmental, economic and social factors which have helped to shape the development of the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents. Consultation comments were considered carefully, and as a result some minor amendments were made to the Sustainability Appraisal framework and objectives.
Review of Literature, Plans, Programmes and Policies

0.7 The South Norfolk Local Plan Documents, including the Wymondham AAP are influenced by other plans, policies and programmes. Not only does the AAP document need to be developed in conformity to international and national guidance it also needs to be developed within a broad range of sustainability objectives.

0.8 The SA Scoping Report reviewed a wide range of relevant European, national, regional and local documents. As part of this review, the following key implications/considerations were identified (all being key elements of the adopted Joint Core Strategy):

- Supporting local economic growth, through the provision of new employment land.
- Ensure there is an adequate supply of new housing, to meet all the objectively assessed needs of the District.
- Ensuring the sustainable use of transport – specific consideration to the location of sites where there is access to public transport.
- Protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment – ensuring new housing and employment areas are not located within the most sensitive environments and protecting sensitive landscapes, biodiversity and historical assets.
- Ensuring the effective use of natural resources and minimising the vulnerability to climate change.
- Minimising flood risk – ensuring new allocations neither increase flood risk in areas or are located on sites at high risk of flooding.

0.9 One change to planning policy of particular note during the preparation of the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents and the SA has been the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. This superseded and streamlined previous national planning guidance (principally Planning Policy Statements); however the key objectives of national guidance remain largely unaltered. The NPPF introduced a “presumption in favour of sustainable development”, and the explicit requirement to demonstrate that documents are viable. In addition to the NPPF, the Localism Act (2011) also abolished the regional tier of governance from the planning system and revoked the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy.
Baseline Information: Social, Environmental and Economic

0.10 Environmental, economic and social information was gathered to provide a baseline of the current situation within the district. This information includes a spatial portrait of South Norfolk, including information on the environment and landscape, water resources, waste, energy resources, education, the economy, transport provision and access to services. A “business as usual” evolution of the baseline has also been prepared; the conclusion being that with the adopted Joint Core Strategy in place, the baseline evolution would not be significantly different without the implementation of South Norfolk Local Plan Documents such as the Wymondham AAP.

Key Sustainability Issues and Opportunities

0.11 The review of the plans, policies and programmes together with the baseline data has highlighted a number of key sustainability issues and opportunities which could affect development within South Norfolk. These have been fully taken into consideration through the preparation of the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents, including the Wymondham AAP. The key points identified are:

- South Norfolk has a wealth of natural assets and historic assets which need to be protected from development pressures and enhanced.
- There is a lack of previously developed land within the district, so much of the new development will need to be on greenfield land.
- There are high levels of motor vehicle use within the district, with a need for modal shift to non-car transport to occur.
- More jobs should be located closer to centres of population, reducing the dependence on the private car.
- Household sizes within South Norfolk are becoming smaller and individuals are living longer.
- There are significant pockets of deprivation within the area, particularly affecting rural communities.
- There is a need to provide improved access to the countryside and local green spaces.
- There is a need to improve the quality of both new and existing housing stock.
- There is currently an unbalanced workforce, with graduates frequently taking up intermediate jobs, presenting difficulties for those with lower qualifications from accessing work.
The Sustainability Appraisal Framework

0.12 A SA Framework was developed having regard to the key issues and opportunities identified above and this was consulted on through the Scoping Report in 2010. The Framework was based around a number of objectives and indicators and represents a recognised approach to the assessment of the environmental, economic and social impacts resulting from a plan, it also allows the comparison of individual policies and allocations. The SA Framework is shown in Table 0.1 below:

Table 0.1 – Environmental, Social & Economic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Objectives</th>
<th>Social Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>S 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>S 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>S 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>S 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To improve the education and skills of the population overall
To improve the health of the population overall
To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity
To improve the quality of where people live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of the Wymondham AAP it was considered that not all of the SA objectives were directly relevant, therefore some objectives were scoped out as shown in Chapter 9 of the main SA report.

Testing the Wymondham Area Action Plan Objectives against the SA Framework

The Council used the SA Framework to test the objectives of the Wymondham AAP. This showed that there is generally a high level of compatibility and most of the AAP objectives have a neutral or positive effect on meeting the SA Framework Objectives. A few potential conflicts were flagged up, primarily related to the environmental objectives and the requirement to allocate land for new housing and employment uses. These conflicts can be addressed and mitigated through the SA process.

Developing Alternative Options

The adopted JCS allocates at least 2,200 new houses and 20 hectares of employment land (including an allocation of around 15 hectares) to Wymondham, along with a variety of other infrastructure improvements relating particularly to transport and green infrastructure. This requirement needs to be set against a number of major constraints affecting the location and quantum of growth in the town; the need to maintain and strengthen the strategic gap between Wymondham and
Hethersett, the need to maintain the historic setting of the town and Abbey and the need to resolve secondary education issues.

0.16 Developing alternative options in the Wymondham AAP can be split into 2 distinct sections:

1. Assessing the sites proposed for development (following the same process that was used to assess sites for the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document) to enable broad options for the location of growth in Wymondham to be developed and evaluated leading to the allocation of development sites; and

2. Developing additional policies and proposals specific to the AAP, presenting alternative options where appropriate, leading to final policy wordings.

Assessing Site Sustainability

0.17 In total 79 individual sites were taken through a site assessment process. Firstly each site was assessed on its own merits against a detailed site checklist. This checklist included 39 different criteria grouped under a number of main headings as shown below. To ensure that the site assessment process itself was robust an SA of the site assessment criteria was undertaken.

- Location principles (relationship to settlement hierarchy and settlement boundaries);

- Existing land use policies (such as whether a site falls within a Primary Shopping Area);

- Undeveloped land (whether the site is brownfield/greenfield and the agricultural land classification);

- Landscape/ Townscape/ Historic environment designations (such as whether the site is close to a Conservation Area or Scheduled Monument);

- Current land use (whether the site is in use or vacant);

- Ecology/biodiversity (for instance, whether the site is close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest);

- Contamination/pollution (whether any is known to be present);

- Flood risk (whether the site is within Flood Zone 1, 2 or 3)

- Hazardous zone (whether the site falls within a hazardous zone as defined by the Health & Safety Executive)
• **Public transport access** (whether the site is within 800m of a bus service to a market town or Norwich)

• **Utilities** (whether known to be in place or inadequate)

• **Access to local services** (whether the site has access to 0, 1-4, or 5 local services (such as school, bus service, healthcare and food store))

• **Other material considerations such site availability** (whether the site is being actively promoted, and whether multiple landowners are involved)

0.18 The results of the individual site assessments were shown in a ‘traffic light’ assessment table where major constraints were shown as red, less serious impacts shown as amber and no direct impacts shown as green. However, this is merely illustrative of the issues considered when assessing sites. It would be over-simplistic to assume that a site with more green results would automatically be preferred over a site with several red or amber results. Professional judgment was also used to assess each site on its own merits, considering what mitigation would be required to make the site acceptable, and whether this mitigation would be likely to result in a viable development.

0.19 Each assessed site has a section with overall comments, within which the conclusion on the acceptability (or otherwise) of the site is reached. This balances consideration of all the criteria scores and comments received in reaching the conclusion.

### Developing Options/Alternatives

0.20 Because of the high level of growth allocated to Wymondham in the JCS the consideration of alternatives has been a fundamental element in the development of the Wymondham AAP.

0.21 The Council used the results of the individual site assessments together with comments from public consultation, the objectives of the AAP and the key sustainability issues identified in the SA Scoping Report to develop a number of options for the distribution of housing and employment growth in the town.

0.22 At a relatively early stage of plan production (before the Preferred Options iteration was drawn up), it was concluded that assessing potential housing numbers above 2200 was not a reasonable alternative. This is because there is insufficient space on the Wymondham High School Academy site to expand (further) to accommodate pupils generated from more than 2200 dwellings. No other proposal and/or site for delivering additional 11-18 capacity in Wymondham has been proposed with an adequate level of detail, cost and timeframe which could provide any meaningful assurance that it could be acceptable and deliverable to the High School and/or the Education Authority.
Developing Other Policies and Proposals in the Wymondham Area Action Plan

0.23 The Wymondham AAP is about more than a simple assessment of sites suggested for development. The AAP also contains a number of other policies and proposals specific to Wymondham. Because of their nature many of these policies and proposals do not have alternative options but they have still been subject to SA to identify any potential effects that may need to be mitigated.

Predicting and Evaluating the Effects of the Wymondham Area Action Plan

0.24 To enable the effects of the options for the distribution of housing and employment growth in Wymondham to be predicted each option was tested against the SA Framework. This showed that each option has potential positive and negative effects which have been summarised and evaluated to allow the Council to develop its Preferred Options for housing and employment growth.

0.25 The Council also tested the other policies and proposals in the AAP against the SA Framework to determine whether these would have any significant effects. It was shown that the other policies and proposals would have mainly positive effects, with the exception of the relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club, in terms of impact on the Strategic Gap and the use of greenfield land.

Overall Effects of the Wymondham Area Action Plan

0.26 The overall effect of the pattern of growth in South Norfolk was assessed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of the adopted JCS (September 2009). In setting the settlement hierarchy for South Norfolk the JCS SA considered synergistic and cumulative impacts such as water quality and biodiversity. It has been concluded that the likely significant environmental effects of the Wymondham AAP will be broadly similar to those identified in the JCS SA e.g. the loss of agricultural land and some impacts on landscape character due to the need for the majority of new development to be on greenfield sites. However the level of growth proposed for Wymondham is also likely to lead to an increase in the self sustainability of Wymondham through a better balance of homes and jobs, greater levels of walking, cycling and public transport use and significantly improved levels of green infrastructure.

Short-term effects

0.27 Most of the impacts resulting from the Wymondham AAP will be permanent, however there will be some short-term impacts whilst construction is taking place e.g. noise, dust and HGV movements. The potential extraction of sand and gravel from a site prior to the commencement of a development could be viewed as a positive short term effect, particularly if used in on-site construction activity.
Medium and long-term effects

0.28 Once built new development sites will have permanent medium and long terms impacts. The level of growth proposed in Wymondham will require expansion of the development boundary into open countryside with resulting loss of agricultural land and potential adverse impact on landscape character.

0.29 It is inevitable that major growth will lead to an increase in car usage in the town however particular effort has been made to allocate sites close to public transport links and which are accessible to services and facilities to maximise walking and cycling.

0.30 Concentrating the majority of new growth in South Wymondham will have some positive environmental benefits. It is well located to the town and railway station and improvements to the railway bridge to benefit pedestrians and cyclists will bring benefits to both existing and future residents of South Wymondham. The expansion of employment land in Wymondham will retain more employment activity in the town itself minimising the need for residents to commute to Norwich and other locations.

Cumulative and synergistic effects

0.31 The JCS SA considered potential cumulative/synergistic effects of JCS policies and the potential impacts on water quality and biodiversity were considered to be of particular importance.

0.32 Other cumulative effects will also be likely to occur through the implementation of the Wymondham AAP alongside the Site Specific Allocations and Policies document, the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan and Norwich City Local Plan. Together these could include pressure on local services and infrastructure such as water supply, wastewater treatment capacity and major transport junctions. Some cumulative impacts could be positive such as enabling thresholds for key services to be reached.

Consideration of Alternatives

0.33 Alternatives have been considered in three different areas:

1. Due to the capacity constraints of Wymondham High School Academy limiting the growth of houses in Wymondham to 2200 and there not being a viable and deliverable solution to deliver additional capacity in another way, it was concluded that there were no ‘reasonable alternatives’ (by way of higher housing numbers) to the minimum 2200 dwellings allocated to Wymondham in the Joint Core Strategy.

2. Each of the 79 proposed sites was assessed in detail, with the results forming part of the Preferred Options consultation in March 2013.
3. A range of strategic options for the location of the 2200 dwellings (concentrated to the north, to the south, to the west of Wymondham, or dispersed amongst a number of small sites around the town) and the 20 hectares of new employment land were considered and appraised before the final choice of allocated sites was made.

**Mitigation Measures**

0.34 Key mitigation measures to support the overall level of growth in South Norfolk have been considered as an integral part of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The Wymondham AAP also includes elements of mitigation such as major transport improvements (at the Thickthorn junction, for instance), the need for various new schools, improved green infrastructure, utilities upgrades and new community facilities.

0.35 The JCS provides for a range of improvements required for strategic provisions of transport, green infrastructure and utilities, to be funded by a combination of developer contributions, utility providers, Norfolk County Council and the Highways Agency.

0.36 Site specific mitigation measures were considered as an integral part of assessing the suitability of sites in the Wymondham area. In cases where necessary and appropriate mitigation was not thought to be achievable that site was not allocated. The Wymondham AAP includes policy considerations to address and mitigate identified effects in relation to allocated sites. Such considerations include the requirement for local off-site road improvements, foul and surface water drainage network improvements, the provision of landscaping, the provision of a new school, design requirements for developments to be sympathetic to particular local circumstances. Other mitigations will include potential improvements to bus services through Bus Rapid Transit.

0.37 Although each site’s mitigation requirements differ, common mitigation measures required for allocated sites include elements such as:

- the need for appropriate boundary landscaping on sites which will extend the footprint of a settlement into the countryside to provide a ‘soft’ edge;
- the need for appropriate non-car egress/access to the site, with more general improvements for public transport;
- contributions to maintaining, protecting and improving green infrastructure in and around Wymondham to alleviate potential indirect impacts of housing developments on sites such as Lower Wood, Ashwellthorpe, SSSI
- the need to consider, where relevant (on larger sites only) whether extraction of sand and gravel prior to development taking place is feasible and deliverable.
Monitoring of Significant Effects

0.38 The monitoring regime for the Sustainability Appraisal of the Wymondham AAP will track the same indicators as the other South Norfolk Local Plan documents (including the Joint Core Strategy).

0.39 To monitor the evolution of the effects the Wymondham AAP will have on the baseline information (monitored through indicators), the focus will be on use of public transport as well as walking and cycling as a means to access services, facilities and employment and to monitor the impacts on landscape, townscape and historic character associated with growth. Clearly the delivery of housing and employment land will continue to be monitored (as it has been for decades).


0.40 The Preferred Options consultation document outlined the sites that the Council intended to allocate for housing and employment, as well as a number of other specific policies and proposals for Wymondham. The justification for these sites, policies and proposals was outlined in an interim SA Report which accompanied the Preferred Options consultation.

Update since the 2013 Preferred Options Consultation

0.41 The Interim SA Report has been updated to take into account the responses to the Preferred Options public consultation which took place between January and March 2013. This has resulted in the publication of this Draft SA Report, dated September 2013.

0.42 Since the Preferred Options consultation the Council have had to amend the sites allocated for housing in the AAP. A number of sites have been granted planning permission under the 5 year land supply argument, which effectively means that the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been met. The Council have therefore de-allocated sites identified for housing in the Preferred Options document which do not have planning permission although the overall strategy for growth support by the SA has not changed. The Council still favour large scale development to the south of the town, with a spread of smaller sites elsewhere.

0.43 A minor change was made following the Preferred Options consultation to extend the size of the employment allocation at Elm Farm Business Park. This is not a significant alteration to the plan and again does not change the overall strategy and reasoning for the distribution of employment growth. The Council has also granted planning permission on its preferred supermarket site since the Preferred Options consultation was published.
0.44 The Kett’s County Landscape policy was flagged up during the Preferred Options consultation as needing work. In response to this the Environmental Objective has been improved and a suite of new policies have been included to address green infrastructure.
1. **Introduction**

**Terms of Reference**

1.1 This is the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Wymondham Area Action Plan (AAP) incorporating the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

**Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal Report**

1.2 This report is the Draft SA Report (Stage C) of the Sustainability Appraisal process. It incorporates the requirements of the Environmental Report as required by Article 5(1) of the SEA Directive. It is a key output of the appraisal process, presenting information on the effects of the plan. This report also covers Stages A and B of the SA/SEA process as presented in Table 1.1 below.

**Preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal**

1.3 South Norfolk Council officers have prepared all stages of the SA in-house, with advice, information and support from various partners and colleagues, such as Norfolk County Council, the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage.

1.4 Table 1.1 below sets out the SA/SEA tasks and the timetable and responsibility for completing these tasks in the context of the preparation of the Wymondham AAP.

**Table 1.1: SA/SEA Programme and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA/SEA Stage</th>
<th>SA Tasks</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage A:</strong> Setting the context, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope</td>
<td>A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives</td>
<td>August 2010 Revised September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2: Collecting baseline information</td>
<td>August 2010 Revised September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems</td>
<td>August 2010 Revised September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4: Developing the SA framework</td>
<td>August 2010 Revised September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage B:</strong> Developing and refining options and assessing</td>
<td>B1: Testing the Local Plan Document objectives against the SA framework</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2: Developing the Local Plan Document options</td>
<td>August 2010 August 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of the SA/SEA

1.5 South Norfolk Council has relied on published data and information provided by others (as well as internal SNC data) in the production of this SA Report. The compiled sustainability baseline data has been used to provide a ‘snapshot’ of current key issues in South Norfolk.

Structure of the SA Report

1.6 The SA Report is set out as follows:

- **Section 1** of this report provides an introduction to the project including background, purpose of the SA Report, timetable for preparation and SA/SEA limitations;

- **Section 2** outlines the legislative context and requirements of SA and SEA and summarises the approach taken for the SA/SEA process;
• **Section 3** describes the South Norfolk Local Plan context, including the Joint Core Strategy and the emerging suite of Local Plan documents currently being prepared;

• **Section 4** presents the review of relevant literature, plans, programmes and policies and implications for the Wymondham AAP and SA/SEA (Task A1);

• **Section 5** describes the sustainability baseline conditions for the South Norfolk Council area, including Wymondham and also details the likely evolution of the baseline without the implementation of the Wymondham AAP (Task A2);

• **Section 6** identifies the main sustainability issues and opportunities for South Norfolk and Wymondham (Task A3);

• **Section 7** discusses the development of the SA Framework (Task A4)

• **Section 8** details the consultation on the scope of the SA (Task A5);

• **Section 9** presents the SA/SEA Framework including the objectives used to assess the proposed sites in the Wymondham AAP, presents the findings from the compatibility test between the Wymondham AAP objectives and SA/SEA objectives (Task B1);

• **Section 10** provides details of the individual assessment of sites, the development of broad options and the assessment of other policies and proposals in the Wymondham AAP (Task B2);

• **Section 11** presents the predictions of the effects of the Wymondham AAP (Task B3);

• **Section 12** presents the evaluation of the effects of the Wymondham AAP (Task B4);

• **Section 13** presents the mitigation recommendations developed as a result of the appraisal to strengthen the Wymondham AAP (Task B5); and

• **Section 14** provides details of the proposed monitoring framework linked to specific indicators (Task B6).
2. Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal Legislative Requirements and Approach

Legislative Requirements

2.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) and the Development Plan Regulations, there is a requirement for local planning authorities to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) on each of its Local Development Documents. In July 2004 an assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, known as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), became a statutory requirement in accordance with European Directive 2001/42/EC. The objective of the SEA Directive is to provide a high level of protection to the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans with a view to promoting sustainable development. The SEA also works to inform the decision-making process through the identification and assessment of the cumulative significant effects a plan or programme will have on the environment at the strategic level.

2.2 In accordance with the European Directive, the SEA Regulations and Department for Communities and Local Government guidance, a combined SA/SEA has been undertaken on the Wymondham Area Action Plan (AAP). Guidance on carrying out this SA/SEA was taken from:

- Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (DCLG, 2005; superseded 2010);
- DCLG Plan-Making Manual: Sustainability Appraisal (2010; supersedes the above document);
- A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (DCLG, 2006);

Approach to the SA/SEA Process

2.3 In applying the SA/SEA to the Wymondham AAP, South Norfolk Council aims to:

- Identify options for delivering sustainable growth in housing, employment and facilities in South Norfolk;
- Further enhance positive environmental, social and economic effects of the plan; and
- Reduce and minimise the negative environmental, social and economic effects that may result from the implementation of the plan.

2.4 To ensure that the SA/SEA is robust and complies with current legislation and best practice, it follows Stages A-E, identified in the DCLG document ‘A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment Directive’ and the DCLG ‘Plan-Making Manual’ see Figure 2.1 below:

**Figure 2.1: The SA/SEA Process**

- **Stage A** – identifying other plans and programmes, establishing baseline conditions and SA/SEA objectives, identifying sustainability issues, developing the SA/SEA Framework and consulting on the scope;

- **Stage B** – developing and refining options, predicting, evaluating and mitigating the effects. There have been a number of rounds of public consultation, the results of which have been incorporated in this SA Report;

- **Stage C** – preparing the Draft SA Report. The SA/SEA guidance documents referred to above have been used to prepare this report;

- **Stage D** – Consultation on the Interim SA Report took place in Spring 2013 as part of the Preferred Options stage. This draft SA Report builds on this and consultation on the Pre-Submission Wymondham AAP and the Draft SA Report will run from the 1 November to mid December 2013;
- **Stage E** – Stage not reached yet.

**Components of the Environmental Report that make up the SA Report**

2.5 This SA Report incorporates the requirements for an Environmental Report, as set out in the DCLG Plan-Making Manual. Table 2.2 below indicates where specific requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive can be found within this report.

**Table 2.2: SEA Directive Requirements Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Report Requirements</th>
<th>Section of this Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected</td>
<td>Section 5 and 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC</td>
<td>Section 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation</td>
<td>Section 4 and Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors</td>
<td>Section 11 and Appendices 6, 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme</td>
<td>Section 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information</td>
<td>Section 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A description of the measures envisaged concerning</td>
<td>Section 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monitoring in accordance with Article 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings</td>
<td>Start of Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **South Norfolk Local Plan Context**

**Introduction**

3.1 A new system for the preparation of development plans was introduced under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). Under this system, which was amended by the Localism Act (2011), a (Replacement) South Norfolk Local Plan is gradually being prepared, which will eventually supercede the adopted (2003) South Norfolk Local Plan.

**The Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk**

3.2 The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) was adopted in 2011 and covers the three districts of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. It sets out the long-term vision and objectives for these areas, including strategic policies for steering and shaping development. It identifies broad locations for new housing and employment growth and changes to transport infrastructure and other supporting community facilities, as well as defining areas where development should be limited. It also helps co-ordinate and deliver other services and related strategies.

3.3 The JCS is designed to deliver substantial growth in housing and employment but this is dependent on investment to overcome the deficiency in supporting infrastructure. The JCS cannot be delivered without the implementation of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy including the Northern Distributor Road. Other fundamental requirements include significant investment in green infrastructure, education, waste and water infrastructure including Whitlingham sewage treatment works and a range of other community facilities.

3.4 The JCS runs to the end of March 2026.

**The Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan**

3.5 Sitting underneath the JCS is a suite of (emerging) South Norfolk Local Plan Documents which will, alongside the JCS, form the complete Local Plan (once adopted). These Documents (which will all run to the end of March 2026) are:

- The **Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document**, which covers the whole of South Norfolk, apart from the areas in Long Stratton, Wymondham and Cringleford detailed below;
- The **Wymondham Area Action Plan (AAP)** (*the subject of this SA*), which will guide development and change in the town, including delivering a minimum of 2200 dwellings, whilst protecting the historic character of the town and the Strategic Gap between Wymondham and Hethersett;
- The **Long Stratton AAP**, which will guide development and change in the village, including delivering a minimum of 1800 dwellings and a Long Stratton Bypass;
• The **Development Management Policies Document**, which will contain a suite of policies (alongside JCS policies) to help determine how the Council will carry out its development management responsibilities to promote sustainable development in the district.

• The **Gypsy and Traveller Document**, which will contain allocations and policies for gypsy and traveller sites.

**Cringeford Neighbourhood Plan**

3.6 Cringleford Parish Council is preparing a Neighbourhood Plan to help deliver a minimum of 1200 new dwellings, whilst respecting the existing semi-rural open and green character of the village. Although it will not be a formal part of the South Norfolk Local Plan, on adoption it will form part of the Development Plan for South Norfolk, and planning applications in Cringleford will be assessed against the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.

4.1 The sustainability appraisal guidance reflects the need for the Local Planning Authority to take into account the relationships between the Local Plan document and other relevant policies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives. The SEA Directive specifically requires environmental protection objectives established at international, European Community or national levels to be taken into account. Other relevant documents include the UK Sustainable Development Strategy, the NPPF, and a range of other plans and strategies, all of which may influence the options to be considered in preparation of the Local Plans document. Information on these relationships will enable potential synergies to be exploited and any inconsistencies and constraints to be addressed.

4.2 The Joint Core Strategy Scoping Report includes a wide ranging review of the plans, programmes and policies which are likely to impact upon the proposals in the Joint Core Strategy area, of which South Norfolk is a part (see Appendix 1 of the Joint Core Strategy Scoping Report - http://www.gndp.org.uk/sustainabilityappraisal). There is a degree of overlap between documents with lower level documents reflecting and applying objectives and policies from higher-level documents.

4.3 The list of documents within the Joint Core Strategy Scoping Report have been examined to establish whether any have been revised or superseded and whether any other lower level documents with particular relevance to the production of the South Norfolk Local Plan should be included.

4.4 Since the Scoping Report was published in 2010 the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published in March 2012, superseding the Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes (PPS’s and PPG’s). The NPPF has streamlined national planning policy; however, the majority of the core themes from the PPSs and PPGs remain. The NPPF has introduced a strong “presumption in favour of sustainable development.”

4.5 In addition to the NPPF there have been two other major changes since the publication of the scoping report, the Localism Act received royal assent in 2011, and the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy was formally abolished in January 2013.

4.6 Table 4.1 provides a list of all of the relevant international, national, regional, county and local level plans which have been reviewed. A full review of all of the literature and the consequent implications on the plans is included within Appendix 1.
### Table 4.1 – International, National, Regional, County & Local Level Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rio Earth Summit (1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rio Earth Summit +20 (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto Protocol and the UN Framework on Climate Change (1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Air Quality Framework Directive (96/62/EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Directive on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (2001/42/EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive (2001/77/EC) Promotion of development of renewable energy sources and their use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive on the Promotion of Biofuels and other Renewable Fuels for transport (2003/30/EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Spatial Development Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning (Control of Major Accident Hazards) Regulations (implements obligations under Seveso II Directive Council Directive 96/82/EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT 10 year Transport Plan (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Plan: Building for the future (2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Strategy (2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing the Future - the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- UK Climate Change Programme (latest version March 2006)
- Local Government White Paper 2006 – Strong and Prosperous Communities
- Localism Act (2011)
- Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012)
- Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2012)

**Regional**
- Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority Health Strategy 2005 – 2010
- Living with Climate Change in the East of England
- Water resources for the future: a strategy for the Anglian Region
- Broadland Rivers Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy
- Broadland Rivers Catchment Flood Management Plan
- New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership for Norfolk and Suffolk: Towards a Growth Plan (2013)

**Local**
- South Norfolk Corporate Equality Plan (2003)
- South Norfolk Empty Homes Strategy (2003)
• Norfolk Biodiversity Action Plan (2004)
• Biodiversity SPG for Norfolk (2004)
• The Broads Plan (2004)
• South Norfolk Economic Development Strategy (2004)
• South Norfolk Tourism Strategy (2004)
• Gypsies and Travellers Strategy for Norfolk (2005-2008)
• Greater Norwich Housing Strategy (2005 – 2010)
• South Norfolk Leisure/Culture & Countryside Strategy (2006-2016)
• Towards Stronger Communities: South Norfolk’s Strategy for Community Cohesion (Oct 2006)
• Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Norfolk 2006 – 2020
• The Broads Authority Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted 2007)
• Learning Disability Employment Plan for Norfolk (2007)
• Tomorrow’s Norfolk, Today’s Challenge – A Climate Change Strategy for Norfolk (2008)
• Partnership of Norfolk Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)
• Norfolk Action – Norfolk’s Local Area Agreement (2008-11)
• Breckland District Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (2009)
• Waveney District Council Core Strategy (2009)
• Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (publication document November 2009)
• Greater Norwich Development Partnership Green Infrastructure Strategy (2007) and Delivery Plan (2009)
• GNNDP Greater Norwich Economic Strategy (2009-2014)
• South Norfolk Alliance Sustainable Community Strategy
• South Norfolk Cycling Strategy
• South Norfolk Corporate Environment Strategy
• South Norfolk Council’s Strategy for Health and Well-Being
• South Norfolk Local Agenda 21 Strategy
• Norwich Area Transport Strategy
• Norfolk Ambition (Norfolk Community Strategy)
• Shaping the Future - an economic strategy for Norfolk and Waveney, and a social cohesion strategy for Norfolk
Key Implications of the Policy Review

4.7 During the review of plans, programmes and policies, a number of key issues were identified that needed to be included when developing the local plan document. A summary of these key issues includes:

- Supporting local economic growth, through the provision of new employment land.
- Ensure there is an adequate supply of new housing, to meet all the objectively assessed needs of the District.
- Ensuring the sustainable use of transport – specific consideration to the location of sites where there is access to public transport.
- Protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment – ensuring new housing and employment areas are not located within the most sensitive environments and protecting sensitive landscapes, biodiversity and historical assets.
- Ensuring the effective use of natural resources and minimising the vulnerability to climate change.
- Minimising flood risk – ensuring new allocations neither increase flood risk in areas or are located on sites at high risk of flooding.
5. **Task A2 - Baseline Information: Social, Environmental and Economic**

5.1 Baseline information provides the context for assessing the sustainability of sites in the Wymondham Area Action Plan (indeed, across the whole South Norfolk district), and it also provides the basis for identifying trends, predicting the likely effects of the plan and also monitoring its outcomes.

5.2 The baseline information was initially presented within the scoping report and has been updated with the different iterations of the SA. Full information is attached as Appendix 2.

**A Spatial Portrait of South Norfolk**

5.3 The following chapter provides baseline information which has helped to enable the identification of sustainability issues, which should be addressed through the various Local Plan documents. It will also act as a reference against which the sustainability implications of the Local Plan can be monitored.

**Demographics**

5.4 South Norfolk District is composed of 119 parishes, within 34 wards.

**Table 5.1 – Demographic: Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline figures</th>
<th>South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous population 1991 Census</td>
<td>103,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous households 1991 Census</td>
<td>43,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Population 2001 Census</td>
<td>110,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Households 2001 Census</td>
<td>46,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 2011 Census</td>
<td>124,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households 2011 Census</td>
<td>52,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 2011 (%):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 0 – 14 years old</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 16 – 44 years old</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 45 – 64 years old</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 65 years old and over</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban: rural split (%)</td>
<td>22.3: 77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density 2011 People/ ha</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected population 2015</td>
<td>128,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected population 2025</td>
<td>141,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Norfolk Insight, ONS & South Norfolk AMR)
Environment & Landscape

5.5 The South Norfolk landscape is a mixture of broad, open arable farmland plateaux and six main river valleys, including the major watercourses of the Rivers Yare and Waveney and the adjoining Norfolk and Suffolk Broads to the north and east. The geology of the district is characterised by glacial deposits. The local Landscape Character Assessment refines the national Landscape Character Areas which identified seven separate landscape types across the district.

5.6 Throughout the district there are a number of areas of locally significant landscape value. Many of these follow the route of important river valleys, predominantly along the River Wensum and the rivers Waveney, Tiffey, Yare, Tas, Tud and Chet. Additional areas of landscape value also include areas of open land that maintain a separation between certain settlements, and a large landscape protection area around the A47 south of Norwich, which is considered important for preserving the historic setting of the city of Norwich.

5.7 There are relatively few international nature conservation sites within South Norfolk, and none fall entirely within the boundary of the district (see paragraph 3.2 of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and Wymondham Area Action Plan Habitat Regulations Assessment for more details). Four small component units of The Broads SAC/Broadland SPA are within South Norfolk between Surlingham and Loddon with two other very small component units near Geldeston on the District’s southern boundary. The River Wensum SAC forms the northern boundary of the district in the area near Costessey although for most of this section the SAC designation is mostly confined to the river channel rather than the wider floodplain. In addition, two component units of the Norfolk Valley Fens SAC are within South Norfolk, Coston Fen (near Runhall) and Flordon Common.

5.8 There are many valuable wildlife habitats of national and local importance in South Norfolk, with nearly 250 County Wildlife Sites and over 100 areas of ancient woodland. Of the 930 hectares of SSSI (across 26 sites), 86% were in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition in 2011.
### Table 5.2 – SSSI Habitats in South Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSSI name</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aslacton Parish Land</td>
<td>Neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramerton Pits</td>
<td>Earth heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broome Heath Pits</td>
<td>Earth heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caistor St. Edmund Chalk Pit</td>
<td>Earth heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coston Fen, Runhall</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan's Marsh, Claxton</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flordon Common</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp – lowland + broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornsett Meadows</td>
<td>Neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritton Common</td>
<td>Acid &amp; Neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gawdyhall Big Wood, Harleston</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geldeston Meadows</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp – lowland + standing open water and canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardley Flood</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp – lowland &amp; standing open water and canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedenham Wood</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leet Hill, Kirby Cane</td>
<td>Earth heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Wood, Ashwellthorpe</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Farm Meadows, Langley</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulham Market Big Wood</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Wensum</td>
<td>Rivers and streams + neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI name</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Mere, Hingham</td>
<td>Standing open water and canals &amp; neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton Wood</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelfanger Meadows</td>
<td>Neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotesham Common</td>
<td>Neutral grassland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotesham-woodton Hornbeam Woods</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley And Alder Carrs, Aldeby</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindall Wood, Ditchingham</td>
<td>Broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland - lowland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yare Broads And Marshes</td>
<td>Fen, marsh and swamp – lowland + broadleaved, mixed and yew woodland – lowland &amp; standing open water and canals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Natural England)

5.9 In addition to SSSIs South Norfolk contains many priority habitats and species and 245 County Wildlife Sites cover 1835 hectares throughout the district.

5.10 The towns and villages scattered around the district are home to many historic buildings and heritage features, which help create their own distinctive character. The district has a wealth of listed buildings, scheduled monuments, and Conservation Areas. There are also historic gardens covering 25 hectares remaining from significant estates in the District, although at least 26 more hectares have been lost since the 1880s. There are also many areas of archaeological interest within the district, including a protected area of Roman-era hedgerow patterns in Dickleburgh. These sites all contribute towards the special character and distinctiveness found in South Norfolk.
Table 5.3 – Listed Buildings & Sites of Special Interest 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I Listed Buildings</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II* Listed Buildings</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II Listed Buildings</td>
<td>3061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monuments</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites of local archaeological interest</td>
<td>2875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Parks and Gardens (English Heritage Register)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: Natural England National Landscape Character Areas. *Source: East of England Plan (2008)*
Figure 5.2: Agricultural Land Classification. Source: www.magic.gov.uk
Figure 5.3: Landscape Types and Character Areas of South Norfolk. Source: South Norfolk Landscape Assessment (2001)
Water Resources

5.11 East Anglia is recognised as one of the driest areas of the country. Pressure on water resource supplies is exacerbated by lower rainfall, the large agricultural economy as well as continued residential and employment growth. Water is a vital societal, ecological and economic resource. Increased pressure on water quality, supply and drainage/flooding aspects are significant issues for the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and the two Area Action Plans to assess/take into consideration. The presence of the Broads Authority area (which has a status equivalent to a National Park) and numerous international, national and locally important water-based conservation areas highlights the importance of water resources in the plan area.

5.12 Rivers such as the Wensum, Yare and Waveney are important aspects of the catchment area across South Norfolk, feeding into the Broads, providing nutrients as well as important habitats in their own right. The Broads and parts of the Wensum are designated as internationally important ‘Special Areas of Conservation’.

Waste, Energy and Resources

5.13 The reduction of waste and increasing re-use and recycling in the district are key Council priorities. South Norfolk is amongst the lowest producers of household waste per capita in Norfolk (351kg per person), recycling 40% and composting 14% of its household waste in 2012/13. There are a number of small household-size renewable energy projects installed across the district, but as of yet no major renewable energy generation facilities exist. All households in South Norfolk now have an alternate weekly kerbside waste and recycling service through which paper, card, metal cans and plastic bottles are collected for recycling. In addition the County Council provides four Household Waste Recycling Centres within South Norfolk and there are 125 community-based mini recycling centres providing facilities for recycling glass bottles, textiles and other materials throughout the District. Future waste strategies will reduce the amount of waste collected from every household, maximise the rate of recycling and extend the range of materials recycled or composted.
5.14 The Council has a published Environment Strategy (2008) that sets out the upcoming challenges and a range of measures to tackle them. The Environment Strategy covers the following topics:

- Managing the environmental impact of Council activities
- Understanding and preparing for future climatic impacts in South Norfolk
- Reducing energy consumption and use of natural resources
- Transport
- Air, land and water quality
- Bio and geo-diversity
- Built and urban environment
- Managing waste

5.15 The Environment Strategy can be downloaded via the following link: [http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/democracy/media/environment_strategy.pdf](http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/democracy/media/environment_strategy.pdf)

5.16 South Norfolk’s ecological footprint was assessed as 5.80 global hectares (gha) per person, which is above the UK average of 5.4 gha. Whilst there is clearly a need to reduce both national and local ecological footprints to sustainable levels, South Norfolk’s higher than average assessment reflects the high food and transport energy costs to be found in a predominantly rural district.

### Society and Housing

5.17 The residents of South Norfolk are some of the healthiest in the country, although the higher levels of deprivation in Costessey and Diss do present some challenges. Educational achievement in 2012 was slightly below the national average at GCSE level. Crime levels are also lower than the national average.

5.18 The district is not ranked highly in the Index of Deprivation (ranking 291 out of 354), although some pockets of deprivation exist. Old Costessey is the most deprived ward in the district, and is within the third most deprived nationally for income, education and child poverty. The district’s rural character presents some problems in accessing services,
with five wards in the district being within the thousand most deprived nationally.

5.19 Housing within the district is predominantly owner-occupied (79%). 335 Affordable Homes had been delivered by South Norfolk, by the end of March 2013, against the three year target of 500 for the period 2011-2014. Characterised by a large proportion of older, rural housing stock, South Norfolk has the highest share of the Greater Norwich housing stock that fails to meet the ‘decent homes’ standard. The price of houses in South Norfolk has increased the most rapidly in Greater Norwich, and the average price is consistently above the Norfolk average.

Table 5.4 – Demographic: Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Stock</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>40,092</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rented</td>
<td>6,752</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Social Landlord / Housing Association</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,809</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: NOMIS 2013)

Figure 5.1 South Norfolk House Prices (Mean) Source: Norfolk Insight
Education
5.20 The provision of education in South Norfolk is typical for a predominantly rural district. First and primary schools of varying sizes are located throughout the area with high schools concentrated on the larger market towns and within Norwich. Further education is primarily from the major urban centres abutting South Norfolk e.g. Norwich and Great Yarmouth.

5.21 Attainment levels in South Norfolk are good, with schools throughout the district achieving higher qualification rates than the Norfolk average - only slightly below the regional and national average.

Table 5.5 – Demographic: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Norfolk</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% people working age (16yrs and over) with no qualifications (at 2011)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% GCSE and equivalent results, percentage of pupils gaining - achieving 5+ A*-C 2012</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% people of working age (16-74yrs) with highest qualification gained from level 4/5 (GCE ‘A’ level or equivalent (at 2011)</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: 2011 Census and Norfolk Insight)

Economy
5.22 For a predominantly rural area, South Norfolk is relatively affluent, and does not have the significant issues of unemployment or deprivation of more urban areas. Some residents do experience issues associated with low income, at or towards the minimum wage (average adult earnings are 8% more than the national average 2012). Obtaining access to public transport services, especially in the more remote parts of the district, is often problematic for accessing the workplace.

5.23 Within South Norfolk, the biggest employers are the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital and the Norwich Research Park at Colney. More than half of South Norfolk’s resident workforce is employed within Norwich City’s area. Wymondham is recognised as a regionally important strategic employment centre and is already home to nearby Lotus Cars, the Hethel Engineering Centre, Gateway 11 Business Park and the Norfolk Police Headquarters.
5.24 The majority of employers in the district are small; only 5% employ more than 25 people. To the south of the district, most of the land is used for agriculture and food related uses, which remains a significant influence. Despite the rural nature of the district, agriculture, forestry and fishing only form 3.0% of employment. Nearly 50% are employment is in manufacturing; wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motor cycles; education; human health & social work activities.

Table 5.6 – Demographic: Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector (% of total employment)</th>
<th>South Norfolk</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation &amp; food service activities</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific &amp; technical activities</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking, finance, insurance etc.</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration &amp; defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Nomis, Annual Business Inquiry 2011)

Transport and Access to Services

5.25 South Norfolk is a predominantly rural district, abutting the major urban centre of Norwich. The district is bisected by a number of key strategic routes (A11, A47, A140 & A143) and rail routes to London and Cambridge. As might be expected in a rural area use of private motor vehicles is higher than average. Public transport to the main market towns and along the strategic road routes is generally good but more limited in the rural areas, as evidenced in the statistics below.

Table 5.7 – Demographic: Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modes of Travel to Work (%)</th>
<th>South Norfolk</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car or van</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor cycle / scooter</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On foot/cycle/other</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works at or mainly from home</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: National Statistics from 2011 Census)
Travel less than 2 km to work | 18.8% | 21.7% | 19.9%  
Travel 2 – 20 km to work | 45.5% | 48.3% | 53.8%  
Travel more than 20 km to work | 12.9% | 14.3% | 12.7%  
(Source: National Statistics from 2001 Census)

5.26 Living in a rural area can increase the degree of isolation, resulting in poor access to facilities and create a dependence upon private motor transport. The problem of accessing key services is illustrated in the following table.

Table 5.8 – Demographic: Travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to GP Services</th>
<th>South Norfolk</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% households within 15 mins walk/public transport</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households within 15 mins by cycle</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households within 15 mins by car</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households within 30 mins walk/public transport</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households within 30 mins by cycle</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% households within 30 mins by car</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Source: Norfolk Insight – 2008 Data)

5.27 Transport improvements for the area are set out in Norfolk County Council’s Local Transport Plan and the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy.

- Norfolk Local Transport Plan:

- Norwich Area Transportation Strategy:

5.28 South Norfolk also has a number of long distance footpaths and an extensive network of public footpaths and bridleways. Enhancements of these are identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Delivery Plan.
Evolution of the Baseline

5.29 The following are examples of broad sustainability issues that are likely to be faced in Wymondham South Norfolk in the future under a ‘business as usual’ scenario (source: paragraphs 3.5.2-3.5.3 of the Joint Core Strategy SA for the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area, URS, December 2012, with appropriate South Norfolk/Wymondham amendments):

- An aging population will create a need for additional healthcare provision and for different types of housing.
- A rising population may increase demand for jobs, housing, and services, and could place additional pressure on transport infrastructure.
- Development will put pressure on South Norfolk’s green and historic spaces.
- Climatic change may have wide ranging and unpredictable impacts, socially, economically and environmentally.
- Biodiversity loss as a result of numerous drivers, including the impacts of development, may lead to a decline in ecosystem services.
- A failure to fully recover from the recent recession may make economic growth difficult, leading to related problems, such as higher unemployment, deprivation and crime.

5.30 The following points reflect the likely influence of the adopted parts of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk looking into the future, assuming that the adopted JCS is fully implemented. Adjusted for South Norfolk and Wymondham, these points are:

- Developments in South Norfolk will reach increasingly high standards of design. All new developments will have been designed and located with local distinctiveness, resource efficiency and reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in mind. They will make maximum use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources, sustainable construction technologies and will be increasingly adapted to the changing climate.

- The number of homes in South Norfolk will rise as a result of increased allocations, with a mix required to provide balanced communities. Communities in South Norfolk will benefit from increased quality of life, through efforts to encourage cohesion, tackle levels of social deprivation and provide access to services.

- The economy of South Norfolk will continue to develop in rural and urban locations, in order to meet the needs of a growing population. There will be a growth in the number of jobs available, including a higher proportion of jobs in higher value, knowledge economy jobs.
The transport system in South Norfolk will be further developed, with Norwich featuring as an increasingly important transport hub in the region. Private cars will remain important, but improvements in sustainable transport options and accessibility, and improved IT links, will begin to offer more sustainable transport patterns.

South Norfolk will have maintained its existing cultural assets and will have the seen development of new or improved facilities. Developments will be increasingly within reach of opportunities for cultural and leisure activities, including access to green space.

Major growth and development will take place in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA), including increased housing, transport infrastructure and employment development. There will be major new or expanded communities in the NPA, built to high design standards and addressing prior deficiencies and services and infrastructure.

In the suburban area and fringe parishes of Norwich within South Norfolk, green infrastructure will have been protected, maintained and enhanced.

The three main towns in South Norfolk will accommodate increasing amounts of housing, town centre uses, employment and services. Residential development will occur in and around five Key Service Centre settlements, with existing retail and service areas having been protected and enhanced where appropriate.

Small scale housing development will take place in a number of Service Villages in South Norfolk, with small scale employment and service taking place development in conjunction. A range of other villages will be increasingly developed within fixed boundaries through infill, small groups of dwellings and small scale business or services.

5.31 In conclusion, the strategic framework for development within South Norfolk is set in the adopted Joint Core Strategy. Even in the absence of the Wymondham Area Action Plan, development is likely to continue in similar vein, with Wymondham continuing to be a likely focus for growth. One factor which may alter this dynamic slightly would be if South Norfolk does not have a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. In such a scenario, it may be that additional planning permissions are granted which could mean Wymondham receiving substantially more than the minimum number of dwellings allocated to it in the JCS, with acknowledged harm (e.g. to landscape) being insufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission unless the harm “significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits” (paragraph 14, NPPF).
6. Task A3 – Sustainability Issues

6.1 The identification of key sustainability issues presents an opportunity to address these through policies within the Local Plan document. This approach is supported by Annex I of the SEA directive. This section outlines the key sustainability issues within South Norfolk, and how these have been incorporated into the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. This section has been informed by:
- The review of other relevant plans and programmes.
- The results of previous consultations.
- Other issues brought to the attention of planners through on-going public engagement as part of the Local Plan process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</td>
<td>Natural environment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Soil / Land</td>
<td>• There is a wealth of natural assets and ecology (including high levels of water quality), that needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage and Landscape</td>
<td>protecting, maintaining and enhancing, and re-creating where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a wealth of high quality agricultural land, which makes South Norfolk an important agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>producer. This resource needs protecting, as its loss would be irreversible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving sustainable access to the countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making the Market Towns and villages greener and with increased links to &amp; from the urban fringe around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich. This may require some retrofitting of existing areas if genuinely sustainable and accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>settlements are to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Green spaces and green corridors will need to be integrated into development, and include the use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>walking and cycling networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a generally poor status of SSSIs, particularly water based ones. Overall, the quality of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>habitats needs to be improved and extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pressures from new development and the relative lack of brownfield land in the district means that a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant area of greenfield land will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscape character &amp; heritage should be retained, reflected &amp; enhanced in development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Design Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-boundary effects are also an important consideration. Activity promoted through the Site Specifics could impact on areas outside of South Norfolk e.g. the Broads &amp; Norwich City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality and biodiversity (particularly the River Wensum and downstream in The Broads) will be particularly vulnerable to changes from new development. Water quality will need to be preserved and enhanced through land use practices, use of SuDS and improvements to treatment works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage and Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built environment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk has a wealth of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings and other architecturally distinctive structures all of which need protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The special historic character of South Norfolk, its Market Towns and hinterland should be preserved and enhanced; the high number of medieval churches, listed buildings and conservation areas are all significant contributors to the unique character and heritage of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve the distinctive character of the historic built environment (e.g. Venta Icenorum) and landscape, protecting and enhancing these and using them to promote the South Norfolk area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New developments will need to be integrated into the existing form and character of local areas in order to minimise the negative impacts that could be brought to the heritage of the area. Historic Landscape Characterisations can provide valuable assistance for integrating landscape distinctiveness into new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield land is in increasingly short supply, particularly in rural areas, so there is pressure to make best use of sites that do exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New construction can have negative impacts on existing development and townscape from noise, air quality and dust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect impacts on the built environment could arise from the additional pressures of development and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures should be taken to enhance the historic core of Market Towns, villages and other distinctive heritage features, by either avoiding or making them able to withstand development pressures arising in the immediate future, such as traffic growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate change:
- Climate change threatens the long-term future of some habitats and species; their capacity to withstand these changes must be improved.
- Many areas at risk of flooding, that will increase with climate change.
- Flood risk in areas like the Broads can be exacerbated by developments upstream causing a change to natural watercourses & the water cycle.
- There is a need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ensure that contributions to climate change are reduced throughout, particularly as the rural areas of South Norfolk are so much more reliant on private car use.
- All new, and some existing, developments will need to adapt to the likely consequences of climate change through their design and locations.
- Norfolk is one of the driest parts of the country so adapting to the effects of climate change, including the ability to design developments that are water efficient and recycle water resources is important.
- Retrofitting existing development, such as improving energy efficiency in private sector housing, tackling traffic congestion and promoting reduction, reuse and recycling of waste as help reduce emissions.
- Renewable energy solutions for the area will be essential and should be sought for energy generation. This would also have the benefit of opening a number of new opportunities for economic development.
- Norfolk’s carbon footprint is currently unsustainable, and promoting adaptive lifestyles will be necessary to reduce them.
- New developments in all sectors, land uses and activities will need to minimise their carbon emissions.

Natural resources
- There is increasing pressure on the natural resources needed to facilitate new development, which will impact on water quality and supply, air quality, energy and minerals use.
- Water quality must be enhanced given the rise in phosphate levels that are occurring in water...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air</strong></td>
<td>courses (in order to comply with WFD standards),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The irrevocable loss of quality soil resources should be minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water supplies must be able to sufficiently service new developments which should be designed to conserve water as much as possible in order to reduce the water use throughout the area. Potential impact on catchment reserves should also be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minerals efficiency will need to be improved to minimise the environmental impact of extraction and processing, including increasing the use of aggregate captured from recycled construction material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensuring that existing and new development is resource efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a need to reduce the amount of waste from South Norfolk sent to landfill sites, and find alternative methods of disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waste management will experience increased pressure on services to accommodate growth, supply new treatment facilities and minimise waste production overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efforts should be made to prioritise, treat and use contaminated land for restoration, provided it’s re-use won’t present health risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources and Climate</td>
<td>• High motor vehicle use, particularly in rural areas, arising from general dependency on private car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Human Health</td>
<td>• Use of transport, particularly in urban areas &amp; towns, its growth in volume has impacts on human health through contributing to poorer air quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Urban Environment</td>
<td>• There is an ongoing and urgent need to encourage a modal shift in transport use away from private cars and into public transport, and to replace CO₂ emitting modes with less polluting forms of transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General environmental amenity will be put under pressure from new development, particularly due to noise, air and water pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transport movements associated with minerals, waste and other service provision will need to be minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SOCIAL</strong></th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEA Directive Topic</td>
<td>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Health**          | - Rising population through inward migration will require more homes, services and facilities.  
|                     | - Increased life expectancy, greater proportion of population classified as ‘elderly’, impact upon services, healthcare & accommodation  
| The Global          | - Creation of unbalanced communities through:  
| Environment and     |   o Increasingly ageing population in rural areas;  
| Local Resources     |   o Increasingly younger population in the city; and,  
| Natural Resources   |   o Migration of families from cities towards the suburban & rural areas.  
| and Climate         | - Household sizes are becoming smaller as more people remain single for longer or become single & thus require more homes to cater for this trend.  
|                     | - In-migration of populations from other areas in the region, and nationally and internationally, is increasing the demand for housing, community facilities and services.  
|                     | - The proportion of the population for whom English is their second language is increasing. This is likely to have implications for the future provision of services and facilities such as education and community learning.  
|                     | - Reducing the environmental impact of individuals will be important in maintaining sustainable communities. |
| **Population and Human Health** | **Deprivation**  
|                     | - Deprivation affects certain sectors of the community in many different ways, including distinct variations between urban and rural areas.  
|                     | - Deprivation is generally heightened in urban areas, but in South Norfolk also affects significant pockets of rural communities.  
|                     | - Reducing deprivation includes:  
|                     |   o Education and attainment  
|                     |   o Income deprivation  
|                     |   o Health and environmental quality  
|                     |   o Crime  
|                     |   o Social exclusion  
<p>|                     | - Reducing levels of unemployment will help reduce poverty and inequality and improve home |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Human Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Urban Environment</td>
<td>affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If the house price – income ratio continues to widen, home owners will have less disposable income as mortgages/rents increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Access to services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population dispersal has a distinct urban (primarily Norwich), rural and urban-fringe split, which has implications for accessing facilities, providing services for dispersed communities, and identifying a role for some settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pressing need to find the best location for new development to have access to services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Services must be provided for an increasingly aging population, and all services must take into account the rising levels of disability in the population. This includes building homes to lifetime homes standards as well as providing specialised accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to higher education establishments is problematic for pupils in the more rural areas where public transport links are poor. Difficulties in accessibility should not be allowed to restrict training opportunities, as this would have economic impacts for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As the population is rather dispersed, the roles of Market Towns and local settlements will be important in order to cater for people’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Human Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The need to promote healthy lifestyles, particularly through the design of, and access to, new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More health infrastructure, and better access to health facilities for all communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Addressing the links between lower levels of health and higher deprivation will help to reduce social inequalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Air Quality Management Areas should be mitigated and the impacts of congestion and localised emissions concentrations should be reduced through traffic management schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic can have negative health impacts across the area and these should be mitigated against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing permanent sites for Gypsy and traveller groups will lead to better access to health care facilities and education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SEA Directive Topic

#### Population and Human Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Localised health facilities, such as cottage hospitals, could be more viable and provide an essential service to new growth, particularly in the rural areas, to relieve pressure on the major hospitals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Crime

- Some higher crime levels exist in the market towns, particularly in the more deprived wards.
- Improving community identity and welfare will be needed to help to reduce anti-social behaviour and increase the feel of local ownership of an area.
- Reducing anti-social behaviour
- Building-up community cohesion will increase the viability of local community-based events and facilities, and improve local democracy and public participation in local elections and Parish planning.

#### Leisure, culture and recreation

- Need to provide access to a good range of cultural and leisure facilities, including improved access to the countryside and local green spaces.
- Facilities for local play and interaction are needed to help build strong communities.
- Access to cultural activity is very important for recreation and personal development and community integration. Adequate cultural provision, such as libraries, will be integral to sustainable communities and need to be planned for from the outset.
- Lifelong learning can also utilise cultural facilities and provision of community centres where community capacity and neighbourhood identity can be promoted.
- An emphasis on good design of new facilities will ensure that communities can benefit from improves standards and it will bring some more ‘identity’ and community involvement in the area.
- Tourism can play an important part in building-up cultural awareness and also for providing jobs and business growth. Support should be given to local tourism-related development linking cultural, social and economic aspects.
- Town and village centres should be retained and encouraged as a focus point or a hub of community activity, particularly in response to local services and facilities being amalgamated or withdrawn from villages into larger settlements, affecting the viability of communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population and Human Health</td>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Urban Environment</td>
<td>• There are varying levels of attainment across the area; generally lower levels are experienced in the main urban areas and amongst older people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensuring the viability of educational services in rural areas will be increasingly difficult as populations in those areas become collectively older. This has implications not only for facilities provision but also for maintaining the existing high standards of educational achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities for lifelong skills and training need to be encouraged in order to 'up-skill' the overall workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Links between lower educational attainment, workplace qualifications and deprivation need to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• As in-migration rises there may be a need to improve educational opportunities within communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Human Health</td>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a variety of housing tenure across the area, with significant levels of owner-occupation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a need to provide a sufficient and appropriate mix of housing types and tenures to meet the needs of all and reduce the number of household in unsuitable accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The most sustainable locations for a substantial number of new housing developments will need to be found and planned for in accordance with the Joint Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The need to improve the quality of new and existing housing stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is concern about any further increase in the gap between house prices and income levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The affordability of new housing stock needs to be at a level that will ensure that local communities and key workers can access their local housing markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The potential for providing new affordable homes must be maximised in each development proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsies and Travellers should also benefit from provision of sites in South Norfolk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More effective use of the existing housing stock, such as returning vacant homes to beneficial use, could increase access to housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Human Health</td>
<td><strong>Transport and accessibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Health             | • Improving access to jobs, services and facilities by public transport and reducing the need to travel by private car.  
                      • Providing appropriate transport infrastructure.  
                      • Improving the accessibility to services and facilities for those who wish to walk and cycle.  
                      • There is a need to improve the opportunities to walk and cycle and use open space provisions as a means of recreation and for leading a healthier and more sustainable lifestyle. |
| SOCIAL             | **Population and Human Health**               |
|                    | **The Global Environment and Local Resources**|
| Growth             | • There is a generally diverse, successful and growing economy, with strong Research and Development and specialist engineering industries.  
                      • Whilst the main focus of employment provision is within Norwich, South Norfolk has a number of smaller, but significant, employment growth areas that are expected to expand further.  
                      • Currently, across the Joint Core Strategy area, there is an emphasis towards large employers being located in the City, and small employers in Broadland and South Norfolk. This may suggest a need to improve diversity of employers across the economy.  
                      • Maintain high levels of employment & improve the ability of local populations & those with fewer qualifications to access employment markets.  
                      • Where agricultural viability declines, diversification and indigenous investment needs support in rural economies.  
                      • Locating employment growth and allocations for new jobs, must be in the most sustainable locations and will be a key factor for a prosperous economy.  
                      • Development of the evening economy can bring increased diversity for business in some areas.  
                      • Increasing the provision of jobs in local areas will increase local economic growth and prosperity, so local jobs provision should be encouraged that can also offer vocational training opportunities.  
                      • Diversification and extension of the tourism base across the area.  
                      • Promotion of tourism development whilst protecting the important landscapes, environment and cultural heritage of South Norfolk. |
<p>| Natural Resources   | Resources                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEA Directive Topic</th>
<th>Key Sustainability Issues for South Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| and Climate              | • Domestic and business waste management, including waste minimisation, increased recycling and resource efficiency improvements, such as energy generation and recovery.  
                           | • Maximising opportunities for economic growth and employment through new waste management facilities.   
                           | • Promotion of sustainable energy technologies.                                                        
                           | • Enabling sustainable production and consumption.                                                     
                           | • Agriculture provides a significant resource for the South Norfolk economy and its ability to compete in the national and regional sector needs to be supported.  
                           | • An environmentally sustainable economy can be developed through a general reduction in food and business mile generation, improved energy savings, development of the renewable energy sector, and through enterprises such as eco-tourism. |
| The Global Environment and Local Resources |                                                                                                                                                     |
| Population and Human Health | • Promoting the knowledge economy will be a key influence in the growth of South Norfolk and will require support through business infrastructure and training opportunities.  
                                 | • There is an unbalanced workforce, as graduates take up intermediate jobs and so present difficulties for those with lower qualifications to access jobs.  
                                 | • Improving levels of educational attainment amongst school-leavers will be a vital part of improving the skills and training of the South Norfolk workforce.  
                                 | • The knowledge economy needs to be able to develop an environmentally friendly sector that helps provide localised training. |
| Population and Human Health | Transport Infrastructure                                                                                     |
|                           | • Access to jobs needs to be improved, particularly for those in rural areas where local employment opportunities may not be so readily available.  
                           | • Providing job opportunities closer to centres of population, particularly in the rural areas, will be important in reducing the dependency on the private car, reducing the need to travel, and building community cohesion.  
                           | • Links to regional, national and international transport networks should be maximised for their ability to bring growth and investment. |
7. **Task A4 – Developing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework**

7.1 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework was developed having regard to the issues and objectives identified in the review of the relevant plans, programmes and policies and from issues and problems identified in the baseline. The draft SA Framework was subject to consultation as part of the SA Scoping Report in 2010 (see Task A5 below). It has been used as a basis for all four emerging South Norfolk Local Plan Documents.

8. **Task A5 – Consulting on the Scope of the Sustainability Appraisal**

8.1 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report was prepared in summer 2010 to cover all the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents together (the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Wymondham Area Action Plan (AAP), the Long Stratton AAP and the Development Management Policies Document).

8.2 The SA Scoping Report includes a review of all relevant plans, programmes and policies (updated in this draft SA), provides a baseline for key environmental, social and economic data and identifies issues and problems which need to be addressed through the South Norfolk Local Plan Documents. The scoping report also provides a framework and set of objectives for the assessment of policies and proposals.

8.3 The SA Scoping Report was consulted upon widely with both statutory consultees and a number of other organisations. The consultation provided useful feedback on the key environmental, economic and social factors which have helped to shape the development of the various South Norfolk Local Plan Documents. Consultation comments were carefully considered and as a result some minor amendments were made to the SA framework and objectives. The 22 objectives that make up the SA Framework are shown in Table 9.1 below.

8.4 A full list of the consultation comments regarding the SA (and the Council’s responses to them) can be found in Appendix 3.

9.1 For the purposes of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (AAP) and particularly the assessment of sites it was considered that not all of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives were directly relevant. Therefore some objectives were scoped out as shown (with reasons) by the lighter text in Table 9.1 below.

Table 9.1 – Environmental, Social & Economic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Objectives</th>
<th>Reason for scoping out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV 1</td>
<td>To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2</td>
<td>To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 3</td>
<td>To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 4</td>
<td>To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 5</td>
<td>To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 6</td>
<td>To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 7</td>
<td>To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 8</td>
<td>To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 9</td>
<td>To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not considered to have a direct impact on site assessment. Where relevant, waste production would be a consideration at the planning application stage within the context of Joint Core Strategy Policy 1

Social Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Objectives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 1</td>
<td>To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 2</td>
<td>To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 3</td>
<td>To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not considered to have a direct impact on site selection. These aspects
The Wymondham AAP is based around a set of objectives. The objectives for the AAP have been based on policies in the JCS, government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and results of the ‘Wymondham 2026’ public consultation that took place in early 2012. The objectives were amended slightly to reflect comments made to the 2013 Preferred Options consultation. The Wymondham AAP objectives are shown in Table 9.2 below:

### Table 9.2: Wymondham Area Action Plan objectives

| **Housing** | 2,200 new houses will be built on a number of sites around the town meeting the highest standards of design, energy efficiency and affordability whilst recognising the need to sustain and improve the historic character and natural environment of Wymondham and provide the necessary infrastructure and public open space to support new development |
| **Employment** | 20 hectares of land will be developed for a range of employment uses to support local employment opportunities and economic growth in and around Wymondham, building on the historically strong take-up of employment land in the town |
and Wymondham’s prominent position on the A11 corridor. Links with, and accessibility to, strategic employment growth at Hethel Technology Park will be improved.

| Environment | A ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grassland, woodland, farmland, hedgerow and wetland habitats will be protected and enhanced with the aim of strengthening the role of the Tiffey valley, maintaining the open land between Wymondham and Hethersett, conserving the historic landscape setting of the town and abbey and creating connections and linkages between green infrastructure. |
| Recreational | Existing public open space in the town will be protected and enhanced and additional open space and formal recreation will be provided to support new development with the aim of encouraging healthy and active lifestyles, improving the quality of life of local residents and alleviating visitor pressure on environmentally sensitive areas. Informal recreation and public access to the countryside will be improved through the extension of existing non-vehicular access to provide a network of circular walks and links to long distance footpaths which could be enhanced to provide improved ecological networks. |
| Town Centre and Retail | Wymondham town centre will be improved to give a greater choice of shops and services whilst retaining and enhancing its distinct historic core and its role as a vibrant market town. |
| Accessibility | The use of public transport (both bus and rail) will be maximised and safe and direct pedestrian and cycle routes will be provided to link key locations in and around Wymondham and to enhance longer distance access to Hethersett, the Norwich Research park and employment expansion at Hethel. |

9.3 The Wymondham AAP objectives were tested against the remaining SA Framework objectives (as shown in Table 9.3 below) to show their compatibility and any potential for conflict. Any conflicting issues will be addressed further in the SA.

9.4 Table 9.3 shows that there is generally a high level of compatibility between the Wymondham AAP objectives and the SA Framework objectives. Most of the AAP objectives have a neutral or positive effect on meeting the SA Framework objectives. The few potential conflicts are between the environmental objectives in the SA Framework and the requirement to allocate land for new housing and employment development and the potential expansion of the town centre. Whilst these conflicts cannot be completely reconciled – the scale of new development allocated in the JCS necessitates greenfield developments in Wymondham - these conflicts could be partly mitigated by the appropriate location of development sites and the application of suitable mitigation measures. The potential conflicts are described in more detail in Table 9.4.
Table 9.3: Compatibility of the Wymondham AAP objectives with the SA Framework objectives
(\textcolor{red}{Red} = potential conflict; \textcolor{green}{amber} = potential neutrality; \textcolor{green}{green} = potential compatibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wymondham AAP objectives</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Town Centre and Retail</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{red}{red}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
<td>\textcolor{green}{green}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4: Potential conflicts between the SA Framework objectives and the Wymondham AAP objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Potentially conflicting Wymondham AAP objective</th>
<th>The potential conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV 1</td>
<td>Housing Employment Town Centre and Retail</td>
<td>Potential conflict exists between the need to allocate land for housing and employment development and potential expansion of the town centre with the SA objective to protect biodiversity, geodiversity and habitat protection. This requires the assessment of sites to ensure that nil or minimum conflict occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2</td>
<td>Housing Employment</td>
<td>Potential conflict exists between the allocation of development land housing and employment and the SA objective to minimise flood risk. This requires the appropriate assessment of sites to ensure that nil or minimum conflict occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 3</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Potential conflict exists between</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59
| ENV 4 | Housing | Employment | Town Centre & Retail | Potential conflict exists between the allocation of development land for housing and employment and potential expansion of the town centre and the SA objective to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment. This requires the assessment of sites to ensure that they have good access plus good accessibility to services by transport other than the car.

ENV 5 | Housing | Employment | Town Centre & Retail | Potential conflict exists between the allocation of development land for housing and employment and potential expansion of the town centre and the SA objective to improve air quality, minimise noise, vibration and light pollution. This requires the assessment of sites to ensure that nil or minimum conflict occurs.

ENV 6 | Employment | | | Potential conflict exists between allocation of employment land and the SA objective to maintain and enhance local distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment. Some uses may have been unsuited to their location thus providing a chance to establish more appropriate uses with a more positive impact. The closest potential development sites to services may be precluded by adverse impacts on townscapes and historic environments depending on the use proposed and the context for their location. The development of land for housing does not have the same potential for conflict as the housing objective states that development will need to sustain and improve
the distinctive character of Wymondham.

| ENV 7 | Housing Employment | Potential conflict exists between the SA objective to minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources due to the relative lack of brownfield sites in the District. This applies in particular to proposed major housing growth areas that cannot be accommodated within existing settlements |
| ENV 8 | Housing Employment | Potential conflict exists between the need to allocate land for the development of housing and employment with the SA objective to improve water quality and sustainable sources of supply. Adverse impacts could be caused by surface water run-off from new development unless mitigated by suitable drainage systems. This also requires the assessment of sites to ensure that nil or minimum conflict occurs with sites of nature conservation interest or biodiversity importance where water forms an important element. |
10. Task B2 – Developing the Alternative Options

Introduction

10.1 Policy 9 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) allocates a minimum of 2200 new dwellings for Wymondham. The base date of the JCS is 31 March 2008 and plan runs until to 2026. Policy 9 also contains several other elements of direct relevance to Wymondham:

- Significant transport infrastructure improvements to the bus, cycling and walking network, including Bus Rapid Transit on key routes in the Norwich area to link major growth locations including Wymondham. Junction improvements on the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass are also identified as being essential, including the Thickthorn junction, which may have impacts for development in Wymondham
- New general employment opportunities in Wymondham totalling around 20 hectares of land for a range of employment uses, including a new allocation of around 15 hectares; and
- Opportunities to enhance green infrastructure throughout the area will be sought, with particular emphasis on priority areas.

10.2 JCS Policy 10 contains a more detailed breakdown of the requirements and constraints to growth in Wymondham. The policy states that major growth in this location is dependent on expanded capacity of the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction and will deliver expansion of the town to include:

- At least 2,200 dwellings located in a number of sites providing easy access to local jobs, services and facilities and the town centre whilst maintaining the strategic gap to the north and northeast and the historic setting of the town and abbey;
- Expansion of the town centre of a quality that will retain and enhance the distinctive character of the existing historic centre;
- Extensive levels of green infrastructure to create a ‘Ketts Country’ pastoral landscape of grass, wood, hedgerow and wetland habitat. This will also strengthen the importance and role of the Tiffey valley, the landscape setting of the town and strategic gaps, particularly towards Hethersett;
- Enhanced bus services to the city centre with potential for Bus Rapid Transit also serving Hethersett and/or Cringleford, and improvements to maximise the use of rail connections;
- Safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes linking key locations in and around Wymondham including new residential developments, the town centre, the railway station and Gateway 11 business park, and enhanced longer distance cycle access to Hethersett and Norwich Research Park;
- Enhanced public transport and cycle links to employment expansion at Hethel;
- New pre-school provision and a new primary school. Secondary education provision remains to be resolved but may require the relocation of the existing high school to a new site;
- Expanded household waste recycling facility
10.3 The JCS states that detailed proposals for Wymondham will be developed through the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP).

10.4 The JCS therefore clearly identifies three major constraints affecting the location and quantum of growth in Wymondham:

- the need to maintain and strengthen the strategic gaps, particularly that separating Wymondham from Hethersett;
- the need to maintain the historic setting of the town and Wymondham Abbey; and
- the need to resolve secondary education provision.

These constraints formed the background for the assessment of potential sites in Wymondham.

10.5 For the purposes of the Wymondham AAP, Task B2 can be split into two distinct sections:

1. Assessing the sites proposed for development (following the same process that was used to assess sites for the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document) to enable broad options for the location and level of growth in Wymondham to be developed and evaluated leading to the allocation of development sites; and

2. Developing additional policies and proposals specific to the AAP, presenting alternative options where appropriate, leading to final policy wordings.

**Public Consultation on the Wymondham Area Action Plan**

10.6 There have been a number of public consultation stages in the development of the Wymondham AAP, which have informed the development of the overall objectives as well as the allocation of sites, the identification of broad options for growth and other more specific policies and proposals. To begin with the Wymondham AAP was consulted on together with the Site Specific Allocations and Policies document until 2012 when the first separate Wymondham AAP consultation was undertaken.

**Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (including the Wymondham Area Action Plan) – Issues and Options Consultation Autumn 2010**

10.7 The Council put out an initial ‘call for sites’ in 2005 and this resulted in various potential development sites being suggested across the South Norfolk district, including in Wymondham. The first public consultation for the Issues and Options stage of Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document took place in September 2010 and included 62 proposed sites in Wymondham. This consultation was accompanied by consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (Task A work). No assessment of the merits (or otherwise) of the sites were made at this stage by the Council – representations were sought simply on the basis of the plans of the sites submitted. A further 12 potential Wymondham sites were proposed during this consultation period. The 2010 consultation also asked for comments on a site checklist which would later form the basis for the site assessment process.
10.8 In August 2011, a further round of public consultation took place on the new potential sites suggested during the last round of public consultation, including the 12 sites in Wymondham. Further or new representations on the original 62 Wymondham sites were also invited. Again no assessment of the merits (or otherwise) of the sites were made by the Council at this stage. The 2011 consultation produced a further 5 submitted sites in Wymondham (these sites were given a ‘Z’ prefix). This gave a total of 79 sites to be taken through the detailed SA site assessment process, which is detailed below.

Wymondham 2026 – Shaping the future development of your town – January – March 2012
10.9 The Council first consulted specifically on the Wymondham AAP in January 2012. A leaflet and survey called ‘Wymondham 2026 – Shaping the Future Development of your town’, were prepared with input from Wymondham Town Council and sent to all homes and businesses in the parish of Wymondham, as well as large number of other consultees. This consultation was high level and was not accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal. However the Council did ask questions about broad locations for housing and employment growth at this stage, which helped to develop the options assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

10.10 The Preferred Options consultation document outlined the sites that the Council intended to allocate for housing and employment, as well a number of other specific policies and proposals for Wymondham. To inform the allocation of land for development in the Preferred Options version of the AAP the Council undertook a detailed assessment of all 79 sites put forward for development in Wymondham and used this information together with public comments from the ‘Wymondham 2026’ consultation, the objectives of the Wymondham AAP and the key sustainability issues identified in the SA Scoping Report to develop a number of broad distribution options for housing and employment growth. This process was outlined in an interim SA Report which accompanied the Preferred Options consultation.

Assessing the sites proposed for development and identifying broad options for the location and level of growth leading to the allocation of sites in the AAP
10.11 The allocation of sites in the Wymondham AAP was considered at two levels. Firstly, each site was assessed on its own merits through a detailed Site Assessment process. This enabled any sites with very significant constraints affecting their deliverability to be effectively discounted for consideration at an early stage irrespective of any other merits. It also allowed the relative merits and constraints of the remaining sites to be compared. The second level of assessment undertaken was the consideration of a number of broad distribution
Developing Options for the Wymondham Area Action Plan - Assessing each site individually

10.12 An initial sieve of all the sites suggested in Wymondham was undertaken following the two district wide public consultations in 2010 and 2011 and the Wymondham specific consultation in 2012 (detailed above), to determine whether they conformed with the settlement hierarchy in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). Wymondham is classified in the JCS as a ‘major growth location’ and a ‘main town’ so all proposed sites in the Wymondham town area were automatically taken through the site assessment process. However, Wymondham is a large parish and contains other settlements which are classified elsewhere in the JCS Settlement Hierarchy, such as Spooner Row which is classified as a Service Village, and Suton, Wattlefield and other outlying hamlets which are classified as Smaller Rural Communities. These settlements are outside the scope of the AAP and sites here were considered under the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document. This fact helped to define the area to be covered by the AAP and only sites that could be considered within the AAP area were considered within the AAP context. An exception to this were sites suggested for employment in Suton which were assessed alongside employment sites in Wymondham because there was limited land suggested in the town for employment but a high requirement of new employment land to find in the JCS.

10.13 All the sites suggested in the Wymondham AAP area were then subject to rigorous assessment against a detailed site checklist. The site assessment criteria had been developed and refined through district wide public consultation in 2010 and were also used to assess sites across the district as part of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document. See Appendix 4 for the consultation comments made in relation to the site assessment criteria and the Council’s responses to those comments. The checklist included 39 different criteria grouped under a number of main headings. The site assessment process also took into account comments received through the 2010 and 2011 consultations from both statutory consultees and the public.

The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Site Assessment Criteria

10.14 The process of assessing sites has been informed by and tested against the SA Framework and vice versa to increase the robustness of the site selection process. To ensure that the assessment of sites was robust an SA of the site assessment criteria was undertaken and is shown in Appendix 5 (Table 10.1 below details how the criteria in the checklist relate to the SA objectives).
Table 10.1  Relationship between the scoped SA Objectives and the site assessment criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objectives</th>
<th>Site assessment criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality and avoid habitat fragmentation. | Ecology/ Biodiversity  
- Tree Preservation Orders  
- Ancient woodland  
- Protected hedgerows  
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest inc. Ramsar sites  
- County Wildlife Sites  
- Special Areas of Conservation  
- Special Protection Areas  
Undeveloped Land  
- Brownfield/Greenfield  
- Agricultural Land Grades 1 and 2  
(Plus notes made of green infrastructure corridors, biodiversity action plan areas, geodiversity action plan areas) |
| **ENV 2**     |                          |
| To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks of flooding. | Flood Risk  
- Flood Risk Zones 3 (Zones 3a/3b where known), 2 and 1  
- Utilities |
| **ENV 3**     |                          |
| To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary |
| **ENV 4**     |                          |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Other criteria  
- Current land use  
- Public transport access  
- Protected rail routes (from Existing Land Use policy)  
- Protected cycle routes also noted but not ranked  
- Public rights of way noted |
| **ENV 5**     |                          |
| To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Other Criteria  
- Public transport access  
- Protected cycle routes also noted but not ranked  
- Surrounding land uses noted on site visits  
Other material considerations;  
- Sewage Treatment Works safeguarding area |
| ENV 6 | To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations  
- Historic park/ garden  
- Notes made of landscape character areas  
- Listed buildings  
- Conservation areas  
- Scheduled ancient monument  
- Site of archaeological interest (NHER)  
Existing Land Use Policy  
- Existing land use allocations  
- Planning histories also noted  
- Areas of open land (SNLP Policy ENV 2)  
- River valleys (SNLP Policy ENV 3)  
- Norwich Southern Bypass landscape protection Zone (SNLP Policy ENV 6)  
- Important spaces (SNLP Policy IMP 3)  
Undeveloped land  
- Brownfield/ Greenfield  
Other Criteria  
- Current land use |
| ENV 7 | To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Undeveloped Land  
- Brownfield/Greenfield  
- Agricultural land Grades 1 and 2  
Existing Land Use policy  
- Existing land use allocations  
- Planning histories also noted  
- Areas of open land (SNLP Policy ENV 2)  
- River valleys (SNLP Policy ENV 3)  
- Norwich Southern Bypass landscape protection Zone (SNLP Policy ENV 6)  
- Important spaces (SNLP Policy IMP 3)  
Other Criteria  
- Current Land Use  
Other Material Considerations  
- Sites on minerals resources  
- Minerals/Waste Safeguarding Site |
| ENV 8 | To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Ecology/ Biodiversity  
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest inc. Ramsar sites  
- County Wildlife Sites  
- Special Areas of Conservation  
- Special Protection Areas  
Other Criteria  
- Utilities |
| ENV 9 | To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling. |  |

### Social Objectives

| S 1 | To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, affordable and suitable home. | (Sites will be allocated to meet the required total housing numbers, but Joint Core Strategy Policy 4 housing delivery requirements for affordable housing will be affected by the potential viability of development on a site).  
Existing land use policy  
- Existing land use allocations  
- Planning histories also noted  
Other Criteria  
- Current land use  
- Utilities  
Other material considerations  
- Site availability  
- Gas pipelines  
- Oil pipelines  
- Sites on minerals resources  
- Minerals/Waste Safeguarding Site  
- Sewage Treatment Works Safeguarding Area  
- Article 4 Directions  
- Overhead cables/pylons |
| S 2 | To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Other Criteria  
- Services accessibility |
| S 3 | To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment. |  |
| S 4 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Existing land use policy  
- Existing land use allocations  
- Primary Shopping Area |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 5</td>
<td>To improve the education and skills of the population overall.</td>
<td>Central Business Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(compatibility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 6</td>
<td>To improve the health of the population overall.</td>
<td>Contamination/ Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sewage Treatment Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 7</td>
<td>To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8</td>
<td>To improve the quality of where people live.</td>
<td>Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic park/ garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes made of landscape character areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listed buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled ancient monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of archaeological interest (NHER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contamination/ Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sewage Treatment Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surrounding land uses noted on site visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC 1</th>
<th>To encourage sustained economic growth.</th>
<th>(Sites will be allocated to meet the Joint Core Strategy required employment land provisions, employment land retained within the context of JCS Policy 5 and commercial development sites allocated in relation to JCS Policy 19 and the potential identified by the 2007 retail study). Location principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JCS Settlement Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement boundary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EC 2 | To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the district. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Existing Land Use policy  
- Existing land use allocations  
Other Criteria  
- Current land use  
- Utilities  
Other material considerations  
- Site availability  
- Gas pipelines  
- Oil pipelines  
- Sites on minerals resources  
- Minerals/Waste Safeguarding Site  
- Sewage Treatment Works Safeguarding Area  
- Article 4 Directions |
| EC 3 | To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth. | Location principles  
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy  
- Settlement boundary  
Other Criteria  
- Utilities  
- Public transport access  
- Protected rail routes  
- Protected cycle routes also noted  
- Public rights of way also noted |
| EC 4 | To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy. |
To improve economic performance in rural areas.

(Sites will be allocated to meet the Joint Core Strategy required employment land provisions, employment land retained within the context of JCS Policy 5 and commercial development sites allocated in relation to JCS Policy 19 and the potential identified by the 2007 retail study).

Location principles
- JCS Settlement Hierarchy
- Settlement boundary
- Existing land use policy
- Existing land use allocations
- Primary Shopping Area (compatibility)
- Central Business Area (compatibility)

Other Criteria
- Current land use
- Public transport access
- Utilities
- Contamination/ Pollution

Other material considerations
- Site availability
- Gas pipelines
- Oil pipelines
- Sites on minerals resources
- Minerals/Waste Safeguarding Site
- Article 4 Directions

10.15 The process of assessing sites using the site assessment criteria is detailed in Table 10.2 below. To display the results of this assessment, a ‘traffic light’ site assessment table has been produced, showing major constraints (red), less serious impacts (amber) and no direct impacts (green). The completed ‘traffic light’ site assessment table for Wymondham is shown at Appendix 6. However, this table is merely illustrative of the issues considered when assessing sites and it is important to note that the assessment of the criteria was not a simple, mechanistic, method of reaching a conclusion on the acceptability of any individual site – in other words, it was not a question of merely assessing the total of ‘green’, ‘amber’ and ‘red’ impacts and concluding that a site is acceptable if the ‘green’ totals are higher than the ‘red’ totals. It would also be over-simplistic to assume that a site with more green results would automatically be preferred over a site with several red or amber results. Professional judgment was used to assess each site on its own merits, considering what mitigation would be required to make the site acceptable, and whether this mitigation would be likely to result in a viable development. Certain criteria are of more significance than others – for instance, a potential site within a Special Area of Conservation (a ‘red’) is extremely unlikely to be acceptable, whereas a listed building on the proposed site (also a ‘red’) might be able to be accommodated within an appropriate site design.
### Table 10.2 – Criteria and Assessment of Site Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Location principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Hierarchy</td>
<td>Sites in parishes in Smaller Rural Communities and the Countryside</td>
<td>Sites within parishes suitable for development boundaries only, or promoted for uses inconsistent with the Joint Core Strategy</td>
<td>Sites within parishes suitable for development land allocations for the use promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Boundary</td>
<td>Sites located further than 400m from an existing defined development boundary</td>
<td>Sites not adjacent to but within 400m of an existing defined development boundary</td>
<td>Sites within or adjacent to an existing defined development boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) Existing land use policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing land use allocations</td>
<td>Proposal for alternative use to that previously allocated; proposed mixed use includes existing allocated use</td>
<td>Proposal consistent with existing allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Shopping Area</td>
<td>Proposed use incompatible with location</td>
<td>Proposed use compatible with location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business Area</td>
<td>Proposed use incompatible with location</td>
<td>Proposed use compatible with location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of open land (SNLP ENV2)</td>
<td>Proposed site within previously defined Strategic Gap</td>
<td>Proposed site outside previously defined Strategic Gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys (SNLP ENV3)</td>
<td>Proposed site within previously defined river valley</td>
<td>Proposed site outside previously defined river valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (SNLP ENV6)</td>
<td>Proposed site within previously defined NSBLPZ</td>
<td>Proposed site outside previously defined NSBLPZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important spaces (SNLP IMP3)</td>
<td>Proposed site within previously designated important space</td>
<td>Proposed site outside previously designated important space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected rail routes (SNLP TRA 6)</td>
<td>Crosses or adjacent to site</td>
<td>None present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning histories</td>
<td>Noted as part of site assessment: Not ranked but extant planning permission given positive discrimination in relation to proposed use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Undeveloped land:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield/ Greenfield</td>
<td>Site predominantly greenfield</td>
<td>Site predominantly brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
<td>Grades 1 and 2</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades 1 and 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Landscape/ Townscape/ Historic environment designations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic park/ garden</td>
<td>Site in or adjacent Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings</td>
<td>On site Adjacent to site Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation areas</td>
<td>Site in or adjacent Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled ancient monuments</td>
<td>On site Adjacent to site Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site of archaeological interest (NHER)</td>
<td>Within or adjacent to site Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Character Areas</td>
<td>Noted as part of site assessment but not ranked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5) Current land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site in use and likely to continue</td>
<td>Site in use not known if likely to continue Vacant site not in use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6) Ecology/ Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree preservation orders</td>
<td>On or affected by site Not affected by site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient woodland</td>
<td>Within site Affected by site Not affected by site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected hedgerows</td>
<td>On or affected by site Not affected by site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI/ Ramsar sites</td>
<td>Site covers/ overlaps Adjacent to site Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Wildlife Sites</td>
<td>Site covers Adjacent to or slightly overlaps site Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Areas of Conservation/ Special Protection Areas</td>
<td>Site overlaps Adjacent to site Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes also made of green infrastructure corridors and biodiversity action plan areas but not ranked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes also made of geodiversity action plan areas but not ranked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7) Contamination/ Pollution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present or potentially present</td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8) Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites in flood zone 3</td>
<td>Sites in flood zone 2 Sites in flood zone 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9) Hazardous Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site within</td>
<td>Site elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10) Public transport access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service to market town or Norwich within 800m</td>
<td>Within 800m of service to market town or Norwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway safety / works required</td>
<td>To be confirmed by Highways Authority in response to Preferred Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11) Utilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None available or available with known capacity issues</td>
<td>All services in place with capacity for development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) Services Access

|          | No services from core list within 800m | 1-4 services from core list (identified in paras 6.60 and 6.63 of the JCS) within 800m | 5 or more services from core list (identified in paras 6.60 and 6.63 of the JCS) within 800m |

13) Other Material Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability</th>
<th>Single owner but not actively promoted; multiple ownership but unwilling partners.</th>
<th>Multiple ownership but issues can be resolved; minor issues that can be resolved.</th>
<th>Site actively promoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas pipelines</td>
<td>Crosses site</td>
<td>None present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil pipelines</td>
<td>Crosses site</td>
<td>None present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites on minerals resources</td>
<td>Present on site</td>
<td>None present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals/waste safeguarding sites</td>
<td>Safeguarded site</td>
<td>Sites not affected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage Treatment Works safeguarding area</td>
<td>Sites within 400m cordon sanitaire</td>
<td>Sites beyond 400m cordon sanitaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 4 Direction</td>
<td>Site affected</td>
<td>Site not affected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead cables/ pylons on site</td>
<td>Noted as part of site assessment but not ranked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rights of way</td>
<td>Noted as part of site assessment but not ranked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected cycle route</td>
<td>Noted as part of site assessment but not ranked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.16 The criteria considered to be most important in determining the overall sustainability of sites were, proximity to local services (including a travel-to-work public transport service) and avoidance of areas prone to flooding (either fluvial or local surface water drainage issues). Environmental designations, existing and neighbouring land uses, settlement form and character and expert advice from statutory bodies were also key decision-making factors, for example, derelict, disused or brownfield sites were preferred where possible. Assessment of the sites identified potential impacts across a wide range of criteria and in all cases, the potential for mitigating the impact of developing such a site was considered, and the cumulative impact of all mitigation required for that site was weighed.

10.17 Representations received (from members of the public, parish councils, statutory consultees, etc) were also taken into account; however site assessment depended on evidence regarding material considerations, rather than pure opinion. For example, in many cases across the district, anecdotal claims of surface water flooding were made, but in only a few cases was flood evidence submitted which affected the site assessment.
10.18 There are some white cells on the site assessment tables. In some cases these white cells indicate that the criterion did not apply at all to that site (e.g. there was no previous Local Plan allocation) and in other cases, white cells indicate that a result was not available for that criterion (e.g. for late-submitted sites). Sites submitted during the 2011 sites consultation were classed as ‘late-submitted sites’ and given a Z prefix. Z sites were assessed alongside sites submitted earlier in the process but had not been subject to public consultation in 2010 and 2011, hence the blank cells. During the site assessment process, Z sites with the potential to be allocated were submitted for comment to Anglian Water, the Minerals and Waste Authority, Education Authority and Highways Authority (and parish councils were advised) before a final decision was made on their suitability. A few of these Z sites became preferred option sites, and were subject to public consultation at Preferred Options stage of the Wymondham AAP in 2013.

10.19 Site size was a significant factor in considering site allocations. Sites proposed for housing development but only able to accommodate fewer than 5 dwellings were not considered for allocation but were assessed instead for potential inclusion within the development boundary. In some cases, sites submitted were too large and in this instance the Council considered allocating only part of the original site. In these cases, some constraints are identified in the site assessment tables which apply to the larger site, but do not apply to the site as allocated (for example, the larger site was adjacent to a County Wildlife Site, the allocated part of the site is not).

10.20 Each assessed site ends with overall comments, within which the conclusion on the acceptability (or otherwise) on the site has been reached. This balances consideration of all the criteria scores and comments received in reaching the conclusion.

Developing Options for the Wymondham Area Action Plan - Assessing the Broad Location and Level of Growth

10.21 Because of the high level of new growth allocated to Wymondham in the JCS, it was considered important for the AAP to take the site assessment procedure one stage further and look at developing and evaluating alternative options to accommodate growth in the town, both for housing and employment. The second task under Stage B2 was therefore to look in some detail at the appropriate level of growth for the town and then to investigate the development of alternative options to accommodate this growth so that the effects can be predicted, evaluated and mitigated leading to preferred options for growth.

Options for the Overall Number of Dwellings to be Considered for the Wymondham Area Action Plan

10.22 Policy 9 of the JCS allocates a minimum of 2200 dwellings to Wymondham, as outlined above. However, as already mentioned JCS Policy 10 also identifies a number of constraints to growth, including the need to maintain the Strategic Gap to the north and north-east, maintain the setting of the town and Wymondham Abbey and resolve secondary education provision in the town.
10.23 The position of Wymondham High (Academy) School, and Norfolk County Council Children’s Services directorate, is that expansion of the High School can only accommodate the expected pupils arising from 2200 new dwellings (from the JCS base date of 2008). However, the Academy (which has a significant degree of freedom to manage itself and its future from Children’s Services control) is very strongly of the view that it does not want to disaggregate either or both of its sixth-form (16-18) element or its playing fields from its current site. A representation sent during the 2012 consultation period from the Academy (Appendix 7) stated that: “Splitting 11-16 education from 17-18 (sixth form) education is highly undesirable educationally. The Academy would strongly oppose any approach which relied on this”. The representation went on to say: “Managing a split site, even for such things as playing fields, is very difficult for a school to manage and, again, would be opposed by the Academy”. It also stated: “The Academy site itself is constrained on all sides and cannot develop other than to consume more of its playing field resources – which are already less than would be ideal for a school of 2050 pupils [which would be the total with an additional 2200 dwellings]”.

10.24 Proper longer-term planning of 11-18 education in the broader Wymondham-Hethersett-Cringleford-Attleborough area (as anywhere else) is lengthy and complicated. Whilst there may be technical solutions to add capacity (by disaggregating 16-18 capacity to a separate site, for example), the educational and financial considerations of where and when to provide additional capacity (including such questions as which solutions would be best value for money and which would be best educationally) are not merely abstract issues – they are critical to finding the right longer-term solution. However, it is also significant to note that no longer-term solution has been proposed by or to, costed and assessed by South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council (as Highway Authority and Education Authority) and/or Wymondham High School Academy.

10.25 The position of South Norfolk Council is therefore that the longer-term (beyond 2026, and new housing levels above 2200 new dwellings for South Wymondham) consideration of secondary education provision in the broader Wymondham-Hethersett-Cringleford-Attleborough area will be most appropriately explored through a wider review of the Joint Core Strategy, which will be informed by the forthcoming update of the Greater Norwich Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

10.26 In conclusion, the Council asserts that the evidence shows that there are not any reasonable alternatives (by way of higher housing numbers) to accommodating 2200 new dwellings in Wymondham and therefore 2,200 will be the number of new homes allocated in the AAP.

Options for the Broad Location of Housing and Employment Growth
10.27 The Council used the results from the ‘traffic light’ Site Assessment Tables (Appendix 6) together with public comments from the ‘Wymondham 2026’ consultation, the objectives of the AAP and the key sustainability issues identified in the SA Scoping Report to develop a number of broad distribution options for accommodating the remainder
of the 2,200 new homes as required by the JCS. At the time of preparing these options 712 units had already been granted planning permission since the base date of the JCS, leaving 1488 units to allocate in the AAP. Taking into account the extremely limited number and area of brownfield sites suggested it was accepted that the all the broad options would be almost entirely greenfield development. The broad options developed and considered for housing were:

- **Option 1**
  Locating all housing growth to the south of the town in the vicinity of Silfield
- **Option 2**
  Locating all housing growth to the north of the town in the vicinity of Tuttles Lane and Norwich Common
- **Option 3**
  Locating all housing growth to the west of the town in the vicinity of Cavick Lane
- **Option 4**
  Distributing the development amongst smaller developments spread around the town

10.28 The same process was undertaken to develop a number of different scenarios for accommodating 20 hectares of employment land in Wymondham, including a large new allocation of 15 hectares. The options developed and considered were:

- **Option 1**
  Extension to the Business Park on London Road
- **Option 2**
  Extension to the Elm Farm Business Park
- **Option 3**
  Land at Browick Road
- **Option 4**
  Employment growth at Suton

**Developing additional policies and proposals specific to the AAP**

10.29 The Wymondham AAP differs from the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document in that it is more than simply an assessment of sites suggested for development. The AAP also contains other policies and proposals specific to Wymondham. Most of these policies and proposals have been included because of direct links with requirements of the JCS, as a request from a particular organisation or group within Wymondham or reflecting current planning issues within the town. Because of their nature many of these policies and proposals do not have an alternative option but have still been subject to SA to identify any potential effects which may need to be mitigated. The relevant policies and proposals are:
• Kett’s Country Landscape policy
• Strategic Gap
• Protecting existing open space
• Providing new open space and improving existing areas
• Relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club
• Land for a new burial ground in Wymondham
• Town Centre definitions and proposed expansion of the town centre
• Retaining and enhancing the distinctive character of the historic town centre
• Provision of a new station for the Mid-Norfolk Railway

10.30 The AAP also considered a proposal for a new supermarket in the town at the Preferred Options stage. Three alternatives were considered and appraised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land at Ayton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land at Postmill Close (Former Semmence Coaches Yard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land at Station Road (Old Saleground site)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Task B3 – Predicting the Effects of the Wymondham Area Action Plan

Predicting the effects of site assessment and the development of broad options for growth

11.1 The detailed site assessment process which was undertaken (described in Task B2) allows us to predict the effects of the AAP in relation to individual sites. The condensed site assessment table shown in Table 11.1 below and the full assessment table at Appendix 6 rates the suggested sites giving positive attributes a green rating, neutral attributes or positions where mitigation might be required an amber rating and aspects of a site that presented significant impact issues or constraints that could not be mitigated a red rating.

11.2 Other relevant site issues were noted in the conclusion of the site assessment table but not given a traffic light rating. Despite not being given a rating they did contribute to the analysis of sites and allowed greater consideration to be given to the predicted effects of developing individual sites. These elements included surrounding land uses, information on green infrastructure corridors, biodiversity and geodiversity action plans, landscape character areas and protected cycle routes.
| Site ID number | Allocated as Settlement | Site address | Suggested Land Use | Settlement Boundary | Area of Flood Land (Hectares) | River Valley Landscapes Protection Zone (Hectares) | Protected Greenspace (Hectares) | Agricultural Land Quality 1, 2, 3 | Glaciated Country | Conurbation | Coastal Access yum. | Coastal Waterfall Site | Contaminated Land | Highways Network | Semi-Natural Areas | Access to Services | Local Access to Open Space | Preferred Options | Comments | Explanation of Amendment to Preferred Option |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 0196          | Wymondham              | Former Railway Yard, Right Up Lane | Housing                  | Site conforms with LCS settlement framework for consideration of housing allocation | Site has been granted planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SITE REJECTED as SHLAA site, not actively promoted for development. Water main crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site above 2ha | Site has been granted planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map |
| 0176          | Wymondham              | Tuttle Lane East, land next to Homestead | Housing                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SITE ALLOCATED FOR 595 HOUSES. Development of brownfield site. NCC Highways - twe located to deliver plan objectives, subject to suitable access would not object, potential for low-serviced site, NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site above 2ha. Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation | Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation |
| 0251          | Wymondham              | Land off Cavick Road/Bradman Lane - Phase 1 | Mixed use                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SITE ALLOCATED - see site 0176 | Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation |
| 1151a         | Wymondham              | Land off Cavick Road/Bradman Lane - Public Open Space | Amenity                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SITE ALLOCATED IN PART - see site 1151a | Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation |
| 1151b         | Wymondham              | Prestion Avenue | Mixed use                |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SITE ALLOCATED IN PART - see site 1151a | Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation |
| 1151c         | Wymondham              | Land off Cavick Road/Lady's Lane - Public Open Space | Amenity                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | POTENTIAL TO ALLOCATE FOR OPEN SPACE AT LATER STAGE IN AAP PROCESS. Water main crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Four safeguarding network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Small area of site flood zone 2. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions. Public comment - impact on Tinffy Valley, traffic concerns. Subject to National Trust Restrictive Covenant. National Trust - detriment to character of landscape and setting of Cavick House. NCC Highways - OBJECT site remote from settlement. Cavick Road/Lady's Lane unsuitable for AddleLINE traffic. Support from developer. In principle supported by Green Party for open space. Norfolk Wildlife Trust - support development of new public open space. Although status of CWS should be taken into account | Following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate particular sites in the AAP for open space. Policies in the AAP will provide for new open space as part of the South Wymondham development and will require other developments around the town to either provide on-site open space or contribute towards improving existing recreation areas. |
Following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate particular sites in the AAP for open space. Policies in the AAP will provide for new open space as part of the South Wymondham development and will require other developments around the town to either provide on-site open space or contribute towards improving existing recreation facilities.

0352 Wymondham Preston Avenue Amenity/Community

- POTENTIAL TO ALLOCATE FOR OPEN SPACE AT LATER STAGE IN AAP PROCESS, see site 1001.

1015/ WYM 14 Wymondham Land North-East Wymondham Mixed Use

- SITE ALLOCATED IN PNP - see individual site numbers below. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Environment - significant landscape issues due to scale of development, particularly need for green buffer between a road of development and setting of Listed Building. Developer support through consultation. NCC Highways - large site, different comments apply to different parts - range from well located to remote from settlement, would object to areas closest to existing boundary. Public comment - harmful to landscape character, urban sprawl, too large. In strategic gap. WTC comments - commuter/ light industrial on part of site estimated 35ha. WWTW capacity, foul sewerage network capacity.

0172 Wymondham None of the land opposite Waitrose Housing

- SITE REJECTED. Water main crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource and supply networks, foul sewerage network capacity issues. NCC Highways - relatively remote from town centre but reasonably located to employment and business, has the potential to be well served by BRT, would not object subject to suitable access being provided. Support from developer. Public comment - traffic concerns. WTC support for 300 homes. Site very prominent as approached from neither well.

0957/ WYM 4 Wymondham Land at Wymondham Tuttles Lane Housing

- SITE ALLOCATED FOR 83 HOUSES. Well located in terms of access to PT, school, retail and emp opportunities. May be TPO lines on access point outside site. WTC - support for 125 homes. Presence for development here has been set as current application 09/2912 for retirement care community. Water supply network and resource issues, foul sewerage network capacity issues. NCC Highways - subject to suitable access with good visibility would not object to inclusion. Has potential to be well served by BRT.

0900 Wymondham land at Nannett Road Housing

- BOUNDARY EXTENSION. Public right of Way beside site. Public comment - urban sprawl. NCC Highways - OBJECT, remote from settlement, although does have potential to be well served by BRT. Potential boundary extension, if filled, does not contribute positively to setting of Strategic gap. Water resource and supply network, foul sewerage network capacity issues.

0999 Wymondham Land north of Tuttles Lane/North Common and South of Molket Road Housing

- SITE REJECTED as development would be intrusive on strategic gap. Water main crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource and supply networks, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Public comment - Urban sprawl - see 1075 comments. Not heard from landowner as individual site since 2003, see 1075. Part of site has valid permission for relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club. NCC Highways OBJECT to part of site from B1172 east of settlement boundary, subject to good access wouldn't object to part that doesn't extend east of settlement boundary.

0931 Wymondham Land north-east of Tuttles Lane Open space

- POTENTIAL TO ALLOCATE FOR OPENSPACE AT LATER STAGE IN AAP PROCESS, see site 1001.

Site has been granted planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map.

Site re-allocated for a care home community (in line with the current planning permission) as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation.

Site has been granted planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map.

Part of this site is identified for relocation of the Rugby Club and part of the site has been granted planning permission for housing since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map.

Following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate particular sites in the AAP for open space. Policies in the AAP will provide for new open space as part of the South Wymondham development and will require other developments around the town to either provide on-site open space or contribute towards improving existing recreation facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L19W/WM/3 WM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Land south of Silfield Road at Right Up Lane</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L19W/WM/3 WM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Silfield Road (allocated as POS)</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L19W/WM/3 WM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Land at Right Up Lane</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L19W/WM/3 WM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Land at Right Up Lane</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A003/WM/3 WM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Land west of Silfield Road</td>
<td>Open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A004/WM/6</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Adj Wyms. Business Park 8111/6 London Rd</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE.** Within Condon SSSI for pumping station (15m buffer would be needed). Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource network and supply, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Public comment - adjacent to mixed use area; adjacent to commercial/light industrial area.

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR APPROXIMATE HOUSES AS PART OF LARGER DEVELOPMENT FOR 200 HOUSES AND SCHOOL.** Plot east of site in flood zone 2 & 3. Final part of site in B11. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Public comment - impact on Lizard buffer zone; potential for linking to existing water mains. Water resource network and supply, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Public comment - need to consider residential amenity.

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE.** Within Condon SSSI for pumping station (15m buffer would be needed). Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource network and supply, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Public comment - need to consider residential amenity. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource network and supply, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Public comment - need to consider residential amenity.

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR APPROXIMATE HOUSES AS PART OF LARGER DEVELOPMENT FOR 200 HOUSES AND SCHOOL.** Plot east of site in flood zone 2 & 3. Final part of site in B11. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Public comment - impact on Lizard buffer zone; potential for linking to existing water mains. Water resource network and supply, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Public comment - need to consider residential amenity.
0167
WYMY6
Wymondham
Sutton Lane
Housing

ALLOCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT. Within Cordon Sanitaire for pumping station (15m buffer would be needed). Water main and sewer crossing sites, would require mitigation by protected easements/diversion. Water resource network, foul sewerage network capacity. Part of site in flood zones 2 & 3. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - reasonably well located, potential for BRT - subject to access would not object although a access to Whitworth Lane is unacceptable unless service lane and junction with London Road are improved. Not actively promoted since 2005.

0177/WYMY
Wymondham
Friarscroft Lane - allotment subject to completion of S106 agreement (09/1916/F) for 12 affordable flats. Remainder of site 09/1262 withdrawn scheme for 18 units.

0177/WYMY
Wymondham
Friarscroft Lane allotment/SNC Property
Housing

SITE REALLOCATED FOR UP TO 35 HOUSES. Water main and sewer crossing sites, would require mitigation by protected easements/diversion. Foul sewerage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Part of site in flood zones 2 & 3, amend development boundary accordingly. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - best located to deliver plan objectives, subject to suitable access would not object, potential to be well served by BRT. Support from owner - SNC - part of site has resolution to grant consent subject to completion of S106 agreement (09/1916/F) for 12 affordable flats. Remainder of site 09/1262 withdrawn scheme for 13 units.

0177/WYMY
Wymondham
Land at Sutton Lane
Housing

DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY EXTENSION - due to allocation of site not in flood risk for employment. Support from landowner. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site over 2ha. NCC Highways - relatively remote from town centre, reasonably located to employment & Business and rail station subject to foot and cycle links. Would not object to this site being included but would need agreement by Network Rail in respect of level crossing on Browick Road. Adj to development boundary but separate by rail line. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.

0177/WYMY
Wymondham
Land south of Browick Road
Mixed Use

ALLOCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT. English Heritage - adj to Lizard, development may be harmful to open aspect of Conservation Area. Flood zones 2 & 3 nearby. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - relatively remote from town centre. reasonably located to employment & Business and new station subject to foot and cycle improvements, would not object subject to safe access. Would need agreement with Network Rail in respect of level crossing on Browick Road. Adj to development boundary but separated by railway line. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.

0177/WYMY
Wymondham
Land at Station Road
Housing/Em

DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY EXTENSION is in close part of site not in flood risk as site already has permission for one dwelling. Sewer crossing site - would need mitigation by protected easements/diversion. Foul sewerage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Public right of way would be via site and zone 2 nearby Conservation Area across a road within 100m TPO area adj. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site over 2ha. NCC Highways - well located, potential to be served by BRT, subject to suitable access would not object. Public comment - support for one dwelling. Close to environmentally sensitive area.
Following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate this site for mixed use development. The Council have already allocated sufficient employment land at Ayton Road 1001a Wymondham Mixed use

Following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate this site for mixed use development. The Council have already allocated sufficient employment land at Ayton Road 1001b Wymondham Mixed Use

Site REJECTED. Public comment - seamer/b bee solution, easy access to town centre. NCC P&T - small plot could be suitable for retail residential. Foul sewer network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. NCC Highways - subject to suitable access would not object. Public comment - site should be allocated for retail

Site has been granted planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,350 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map

Site already in use, remove allocation but retain in development boundary. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. Public comment - concern about gravel extraction, access, dust and rail bridge. Landowner support stable already in industrial use. NCC Highways - close to facilities but would need access from Park Lane - requirement for junction improvement - issue of rail bridge, could not be served by BRT. Foul sewerage network capacity issues

Small boundary extension to reflect existing consent

following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate this site for mixed use development. The Council have already allocated sufficient employment land at Ayton Road 1001b Wymondham Mixed Use

Site has potential to be allocated for mixed use/rein at later stage in AAP process. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource issues, foul sewer network capacity issues. Flood zone 2 nearby. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - well located, potential to be served by BRT, subject to suitable access would not object. Comment to consultation - site should be allocated for retail

Site rejected. Following the Preferred Options public consultation the Council have decided not to allocate this site for mixed use development. The Council have already allocated sufficient employment land at Ayton Road 1001b Wymondham Mixed Use

Site has potential to be allocated for mixed use/rein at later stage in AAP process. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource issues, foul sewer network capacity issues. Flood zone 2 nearby. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - well located, potential to be served by BRT, subject to suitable access would not object. Comment to consultation - site should be allocated for retail

Site has been granted planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,350 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R0169/ WYM 3/ WYM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Land near Silfield Road</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2489/ WYM 3/ WYM 13</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Land off Park Cross/Silfield Road</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z059/ WYM 7</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Elm Farm Business Park</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR 450 HOUSES AS PART OF LARGER DEVELOPMENT OF 1200 HOUSES AND SCHOOL.** NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. Support from developer - see planning application. NCC Highways - issue of access under railway bridge, site not able to be served by BRT. Water supply network issues, foul sewage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Site visit - site not overly intrusive into open countryside and would not have a detrimental impact on historic setting of town/abbey or strategic gap. Development in this location dependent upon proper solution to traffic and flooding issues associated with rail bridge.

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR 150 HOUSES AS PART OF LARGER DEVELOPMENT FOR 1200 HOUSES AND SCHOOL.** Water main crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Foul sewage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Developer support through consultation, NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - site relatively close to facilities, especially the station, part of the site would rely on access from Park Lane and would require junction improvements and upgrading of Park Lane. Issue of traffic under the railway bridge, could not be served by BRT. NCC (P&T) - buffering needed to A11. Site visit - site not overly intrusive into open countryside and would not have a detrimental impact on historic setting of town/abbey or strategic gap. Development in this location dependent upon proper solution to traffic and flooding issues associated with rail bridge.

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR EMPLOYMENT USE - small extension to existing employment site.** Potential to improve gateway to town as approached from Hethersett along the B1172. Small extension to allocation agreed in response to comments received to the Preferred Options public consultation.
11.3 As described under Task B2, the Council then used the individual site assessment work to develop a number of alternative strategic options for accommodating housing and employment growth in the town. To enable the effects of these different scenarios to be predicted it was necessary to test each option against the SA Framework. Tables 11.2 and 11.3 below summarise the predicted effect of each option for housing and employment land (see Appendix 8 for the full SA assessment of housing options and Appendix 9 for the full SA assessment for employment options):

Table 11.2 – summary of the predicted effects of different housing growth scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Framework Objective</th>
<th>Development Scenario</th>
<th>Option 1 Major growth – South</th>
<th>Option 2 Major growth – North</th>
<th>Option 3 Major growth – West</th>
<th>Option 4 Spread across smaller sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.3 – summary of predicted effects of different employment growth scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Framework Objective</th>
<th>Development Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 1 Extension to London Road Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 8</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predicting the effect of other policies and proposals
11.4 Although many of the other policies and proposals in the AAP do not have alternative options it is still important to be able to predict the effects of these policies and proposals, so they were also tested against the SA framework (see Appendix 10). Table 11.4 below summarises the predicted effects of these policies and proposals. (In the Interim SA document a separate assessment was undertaken of the options for location of a new supermarket (as listed under Task B2), but one of the sites has subsequently been granted planning permission, so this assessment is not repeated in this Draft SA).
Table 11.4 – summary of predicted effects of other policies and proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Framework Objective</th>
<th>Other policies and proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ketts Country landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 1</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 5</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 6</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 7</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating the effects of site assessment and the development of broad options for growth

12.1 The predicted effects of each individual development site were evaluated through the site assessment table, resulting in an overall conclusion for each site (see Appendix 6 and Table 11.1). As already described this then helped to inform the development and consideration of a number of broad options for housing and employment which were tested against the SA Framework and this therefore informed the final choice of sites to include in the Wymondham AAP.

12.2 Tables 11.2 and 11.3 above (and Appendices 8 and 9) show that each option for the distribution of housing and employment growth has potential positive and negative effects, which have been summarised and evaluated in Tables 12.1 and 12.2 below. These tables are followed by a conclusion outlining the Council’s preferred option for both housing and employment distribution.

Table 12.1 – Evaluating the effects of the options for housing growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1: MAJOR GROWTH TO SOUTH</th>
<th>Negative effects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive effects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequential approach to development, adjacent to existing development boundary</td>
<td>• Proximity to Lizard County Wildlife Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide services and facilities for new residents and existing residents of Silfield/South Wymondham</td>
<td>• Less potential for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major growth makes it easier to deliver a new primary school</td>
<td>• Use of greenfield sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to rail station to encourage non-car travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities to improve rail bridge, enhance the rail station as a gateway to Wymondham and improve links from the south into town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development would be self-contained, not overly intrusive into countryside with limited impact on landscape and townscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would not impact on the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would provide housing to meet targets in JCS of mix and affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Well located near to employment opportunities at Ayton Road and the Bridge Industrial Estate

**Evaluation of option:**
Although this option does have negative aspects, particularly its proximity to The Lizard County Wildlife, the fact that it is the development of greenfield land and the fact that it will be less easy to be served by BRT, these aspects are outweighed by the positive benefits that this development could bring. It is felt that development to the south offers real opportunities to improve accessibility to South Wymondham by facilitating improvements to the rail bridge and to bring much needed services and facilities to the area. Major growth here would have less impact on the landscape and townscape than other locations around the town as it will not impact on the sensitive Tiffey Valley, views of the abbey or the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett.

**OPTION 2: MAJOR GROWTH TO NORTH**

**Positive effects:**
- Sequential approach to development, adjacent to existing development boundary
- Will provide services and facilities for new and existing residents of Wymondham
- Major growth makes it easier to deliver a new primary school
- Potential to be well served by BRT
- Would provide housing to meet targets in JCS of mix and affordability
- Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency
- Well located near to employment opportunities at Gateway 11 and Waitrose

**Negative effects:**
- Potential traffic impacts and congestion at roundabouts near Waitrose
- Development would be intrusive into open countryside
- Would require significant development in the Strategic Gap between Wymondham and Hethersett
- Use of greenfield sites
- Less well related to town centre than other broad options

**Evaluation of option:**
This site has a number of potential negative impacts, particularly the potential for traffic congestion, the distance from the town centre and potential landscape impacts on the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett. The Joint Core Strategy (Policy 10) requires that the Strategic Gap be maintained so this is a significant consideration. Major growth in north Wymondham would have a number of positive impacts – in particular, the potential to be well-served by BRT – but when balanced against the potential negative impacts but it is felt that there is less opportunity to bring real improvements to benefit the whole town from developing to the north than from some other options.
## OPTION 3: MAJOR GROWTH TO WEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive effects</th>
<th>Negative effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sequential approach to development, adjacent to existing development boundary</td>
<td>• Impacts on views of the abbey and the rural landscape setting of the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide services and facilities for new residents and existing residents of West Wymondham</td>
<td>• Development would be overly intrusive in the open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major growth makes it easier to deliver a new primary school</td>
<td>• Could impact adversely on the landscape and ecology of the Tiffey Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to be well served by BRT</td>
<td>• Use of greenfield sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would provide housing to meet targets in JCS of mix and affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close to the town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well located near to employment opportunities at London Road Business Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of option:**

Development to the west of Wymondham has a number of negative impacts, particularly the fact that major development here would be overly intrusive into the countryside and would have an adverse impact on the historic setting of the town and abbey. This area is characterised by narrow rural roads and lies partly within the attractive River Tiffey valley, and development would impact adversely on this special character. Major growth in west Wymondham would have a number of positive benefits – in particular, the potential to be well-served by BRT and its proximity to the town centre – but it is felt that these benefits do not outweigh the significant potential to harm the setting of the town and abbey in particular.

## OPTION 4: SPREAD ACROSS SMALLER SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive effects</th>
<th>Negative effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sites could be chosen to limit impacts on townscape and landscape</td>
<td>• Could increase traffic volume and congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More opportunity for utilising previously developed land</td>
<td>• Less potential to be served by BRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td>• More difficult to deliver services and facilities, particularly a new primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would provide housing to meet targets in JCS of mix and affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sites can be chosen to be near to employment opportunities and public transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of option:
Spreading the development on a number of sites around the town could have benefits in that smaller sites could be chosen to limit environmental impacts and increase the use of previously developed land. Accessibility to services and facilities is also likely to be generally good. However, distributing development across a number of smaller sites also has distinct disadvantages, particularly making it more difficult to be able to provide much needed services and facilities. Norfolk County Council has indicated that a spread of development would make it more difficult for them to deliver a new primary school in Wymondham. Although this option was generally most favoured by public consultation responses, it is not thought to be appropriate to deliver all the new growth needed.

PREFERRED OPTION FOR BROAD HOUSING GROWTH – MAJOR GROWTH TO THE SOUTH WITH A SPREAD OF SMALLER SITES AROUND THE TOWN

Predicting and evaluating the effects of individual sites and growth options has led to identification of ‘preferred sites’ in the AAP for housing. The Council is proposing to allocate a number of sites to accommodate the 2,200 new houses required by the JCS using a combination of Option 1 and Option 4 above. Although all the broad options assessed have negative impacts, major growth to the south is felt to be the option with the most positive and least negative impacts on the town. It is felt to be the only option with real scope for improving Wymondham (through improvements to access under the railway bridge to improve connectivity between south Wymondham and the town centre). Major growth in one area of the town is favoured by the Council as 1,200 houses in south Wymondham should be sufficient to deliver a new primary school and other services and facilities. The Council propose to spread the rest of the development (which will be of much smaller quantum) around the town to utilise previously developed sites in preference to further greenfield sites.

No reasonable alternatives are proposed for the allocation of housing growth as it was considered that a large development in other locations around the town would have a far more damaging impact on the historic and landscape setting of the town. In terms of smaller sites the Council considers that it has chosen the most appropriate sites in the context of the site assessment checklist.
Table 12.2 – Evaluating the effects of the options for employment growth

**OPTION 1: EXTENSION TO LONDON ROAD BUSINESS PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive effects:</th>
<th>Negative effects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sequential approach development, adjacent to settlement boundary</td>
<td>• Development of greenfield sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to be well served by BRT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide employment opportunities to balance housing growth planned for town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will strengthen local economy and increase vitality and viability of town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will add to supply of employment premises and variety of employment locations in the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension to well established, successful business park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of option:**
An extension to the existing London Road Business Park would bring important economic benefits to the town with fairly neutral environmental and social impacts

**OPTION 2: EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive effects:</th>
<th>Negative effects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to be well served by BRT</td>
<td>• Less sequentially preferable than other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td>• Located in strategic gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide employment opportunities to balance housing growth planned for town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will strengthen local economy and increase vitality and viability of town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will add to supply of employment premises and variety of employment locations in the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension to well established, successful business park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to create ‘gateway’ to the town as approached from Hethersett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluation of option:**
A small extension to the existing Elm Farm Business Park would bring positive economic benefits to the town. The site is located in the strategic gap but the site proposed is small and it is considered that it would have minimal impact on the gap and indeed presents an opportunity to improve the ‘gateway’ to Wymondham (from Hethersett and the east)

**OPTION 3: BROWICK ROAD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive effects:</th>
<th>Negative effects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sequential approach development, adjacent to settlement boundary</td>
<td>• Development of greenfield site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reasonably well located in relation to rail station and strategic employment allocation at Hethel</td>
<td>• Proximity to Lizard County Wildlife site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excellent, near-direct access to the A11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide employment opportunities to balance housing growth planned for town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will strengthen local economy and increase vitality and viability of town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will add to supply of employment premises and variety of employment locations in the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Located close to existing employment opportunities at Ayton Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of option:**
The allocation of employment land at Browick Road would bring significant economic benefits to the town. It is the only site suggested for employment use in the town that would be large enough to accommodate the 15 hectare allocation referred to in the JCS alone. The site is close to the Lizard County Wildlife Site but with sensitive landscaping it is considered that any negative impacts could be mitigated

**OPTION 4: SUTON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive effects:</th>
<th>Negative effects:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Would meet standards of energy and water efficiency</td>
<td>• Not near to existing development boundary, not sequential approach to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to be well served by BRT</td>
<td>• Likely to increase car journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will provide employment opportunities to balance housing growth planned for town</td>
<td>• Not so likely to positively affect the vitality and viability of the town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
employment premises and variety of employment locations in the town

**Evaluation of option:**
The allocation of employment land at Suton would not be a sequential approach to development and would have negative environmental, economic and social impacts, particularly related to accessibility and the need to travel. It is considered that there are more sustainable alternatives options for the allocation of employment land in Wymondham

**PREFERRED OPTION FOR EMPLOYMENT GROWTH- 15 HECTARE ALLOCATION AT BROWICK ROAD WITH SMALLER EXTENSIONS TO LONDON ROAD AND ELM FARM BUSINESS PARKS**
Predicting and evaluating the effects of individual sites and growth options has led to identification of a preferred option of 15 hectares at Browick Road (Option 3) with small extensions to London Road Business Park and Elm Farm Business Park (Options 1 and 2). Although all the options have potential negative impacts it is felt that these would be outweighed by the potential positive economic impacts. Mitigation measures will be necessary to minimise negative effects.

No reasonable alternatives are proposed for the allocation of new employment land. Land suggested for employment use in Suton was considered (Option 4) but this was dismissed on sustainability grounds as these sites were considered to be located too far from services and facilities.

**Evaluating the effects of other policies and proposals**
12.3 Table 11.4 above shows that the other policies and proposals in the AAP are predicted to have mainly positive effects. The only potential negative effects are predicted to be with the relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club in relation to the landscape impact on the strategic gap and use of greenfield land. However, a rugby club would not affect the openness of the strategic gap to a significant degree, and would not ‘use up’ too much greenfield land to permanent built development (just a clubhouse/changing rooms and car-parking). The proposed relocation site is included in the AAP as it already has planning permission; however, the policy does allow for an alternative site to come forward if it can demonstrate additional benefits. The Council have retained the proposed relocation site outside the development boundary so it cannot come forward for other uses, such as housing.

12.4 The Preferred Options consultation document outlined the sites that the Council intended to allocate for housing and employment, as well a number of other specific policies and proposals for Wymondham. The justification for these sites, policies and proposals was outlined in an interim SA Report which accompanied the Preferred Options consultation.
Update since the 2013 Preferred Options Consultation

12.5 The Interim SA Report has been updated to take into account the responses to the Preferred Options public consultation which took place between January and March 2013. This has resulted in the publication of this Draft SA Report, dated September 2013.

12.6 Since the Preferred Options consultation the Council have had to amend the sites allocated for housing in the AAP. These changes are shown on the overall site assessment table at Appendix 4. This is because following Preferred Options a number of sites were granted planning permission for housing under the 5 year land supply argument, which has effectively meant that the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been met on sites with permission. The Council therefore had to de-allocate sites identified for housing in the Preferred Options document which do not have planning permission although the overall strategy for growth support by the SA has not changed. The Council still favour large scale development to the south of the town, with a spread of smaller sites elsewhere.

12.7 A minor change was made following the Preferred Options consultation to extend the size of the employment allocation at Elm Farm Business Park. This is not a significant alteration to the plan and again does not change the overall strategy and reasoning for the distribution of employment growth. The Council has also granted planning permission on its preferred supermarket site since the Preferred Options consultation was published.

12.8 The Kett’s County Landscape policy was flagged up during the Preferred Options consultation as needing work. In response to this the Council held an environmental workshop with relevant key stakeholders and has subsequently strengthened the approach to environmental issues and green infrastructure in the AAP. The Environmental Objective has been improved and a suite of new policies have been included to address green infrastructure. The AAP now includes a range and number of suggested mitigation measures, some of which are specific to an individual site (e.g. buffering to a nearby conservation area) and others which are of a broader relevance (e.g. to ensure that wider green infrastructure requirements are taken into consideration as part of development).

Overall Effects of the Wymondham AAP

12.9 The Sustainability Appraisal of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (September 2009), summarises the main sustainability impacts of the JCS in Chapter 5.4. It notes that the two main elements of the JCS Growth Strategy as they relate to South Norfolk are major expansion of a number of existing communities (including Wymondham) and lesser expansion of other communities. The JCS SA notes that the generally dispersed pattern of growth proposed results in a number of sustainability considerations for South Norfolk, such as effects on the character, distinctiveness and quality of the local environment of settlements receiving growth, and potential public transport implications.
12.10 In setting the settlement hierarchy for South Norfolk, the JCS SA considered synergistic and cumulative impacts. Particularly noted (in paragraph 5.3.3) is the need to consider catchment-wide factors to ensure that environmental capacity in areas such as water quality impacts and biodiversity are not breached.

12.11 Paragraph 5.4.10 of the JCS SA concludes that “the hierarchical approach to growth that is promoted should generally ensure that the amount of growth targeted to a settlement is directly dependent upon the size of the existing settlement, and, more specifically, the availability of local services, facilities and employment opportunities. This is a sensible approach that should help to reduce car dependency”.

12.12 In essence, the likely significant environmental effects of the Wymondham AAP are concluded to be broadly those types identified in the JCS SA. Given the largely rural nature of South Norfolk (and the lack of large brownfield sites in Wymondham) the majority of new allocations (for housing, employment and the relocation of the rugby club) will need to be on greenfield sites in order to identify sufficient new dwellings and employment land to meet minima set out in the adopted JCS. There will therefore inevitably be some loss of agricultural land and some impacts on landscape character. However, there is also likely to be an increase in the self-sustainability of Wymondham, through reaching a better balance of homes and jobs, greater levels of walking, cycling and public transport use, and significantly improved levels of green infrastructure in and around the town to alleviate pressure on nearby environmentally sensitive areas.

**Short-term effects**

12.13 Most of the impacts relating the Wymondham AAP are permanent in nature, reflecting the permanence of new dwellings and employment land (once built on). However, there will be some short-term impacts, principally relating to construction operations – noise, dust, HGV movements etc. A (largely) positive short-term effect might be where extraction of sand and gravel underneath a site takes place prior to development occurring, with that sand and gravel used wherever possible in on-site construction activities.

**Medium and long-term effects**

12.14 Once built out, a new development site has a different set of impacts, most of which will last into the foreseeable future, and be permanent. Most of the allocated sites in Wymondham (particularly the South Wymondham residential site for 1230 dwellings and the Browick Road employment land) require expansion of the development boundary into what has historically been open countryside, with loss of agricultural land and potential adverse impacts on the character of the settlement, countryside and landscape. Other longer-term effects will include additional demand for fresh water, gas and electricity and increased production of waste water, however new buildings are now required to meet increasingly stringent requirements in terms of environmental performance.
12.15 It is inevitable that major growth will lead to an increase in car-usage in Wymondham. However, particular effort has been made to try to allocate sites which are close to public transport links (the train station and on bus routes) and which are accessible to schools, jobs and services by walking and cycling means to minimise the need for car-usage.

12.16 There will also be some positive environmental benefits. Concentrating much of the total housing allocation on the South Wymondham site offers the benefit of proximity to the town centre and railway station. Improvements to the railway bridge will be necessary, including a new subway to allow pedestrians and cyclists much improved access to the railway station and town centre, and this will bring benefits to existing South Wymondham residents too. Concentrating much new growth in South Wymondham will also allow a new primary school to be built to serve the site, increasing the attractiveness of walking and cycling to school. It is hoped that the significant expansion of employment land in Wymondham will also ‘capture’ more employment activity in Wymondham itself, minimising the need for Wymondham residents to commute to Norwich and other locations.

**Cumulative and synergistic effects**

12.17 The JCS SA (2009) considers potential cumulative effects of the JCS policies in paragraphs 5.3.1-5.3.4. Potential cumulative impacts on water quality and biodiversity were raised as being particularly important. As the Wymondham AAP implements JCS policies on overall housing (and employment land) numbers, the associated mitigation measures included in the JCS (including measures identified in the Local Investment Plan and Programme) should ensure that these types of larger potential cumulative effects are minimised.

12.18 Other cumulative effects will also occur through the implementation of the Wymondham AAP alongside the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan and the Norwich City Local Plan. These might include, for instance, additional pressure on local services and infrastructure (such as water supply and wastewater treatment capacity and the capacity of major road junctions, such as the A11/A47 Thickthorn junction). However, some cumulative effects could be positive, such as enabling ‘thresholds’ for key services (such as a new or improved bus service) to be reached. Applying appropriate mitigation measures will be key to ensuring that the effects of any cumulative impacts are minimised.

**Consideration of alternatives**

12.19 Alternatives have been considered in three different areas. Firstly, due to the capacity constraints of Wymondham High School Academy limiting the growth in houses in Wymondham to 2200 and there not being a viable and deliverable solution to deliver additional capacity in another way, it was concluded that there were no ‘reasonable alternatives’ (by way of higher housing numbers) to the minimum 2200 dwellings allocated to Wymondham in the Joint Core Strategy.
12.20 Secondly, each of the 79 proposed sites was assessed in detail, with the results forming part of the Preferred Options consultation in March 2013.

12.21 Thirdly, a range of strategic options for the location of the 2200 dwellings (concentrated to the north, to the south, to the west of Wymondham, or dispersed amongst a number of small sites around the town) and the 20 hectares of new employment land were considered and appraised before the final choice of allocated sites was made.
13. Task B5 – Mitigating the Effects and Maximising Benefits

13.1 Key mitigation measures to support the overall level of growth in South Norfolk have been considered as an integral part of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and also the Wymondham AAP. The Norwich Area Growth Area Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study (December 2007) and the Local Investment Plan and Programme (which is updated on a six-monthly basis) identify and prioritise key strategic measures. This includes elements such as major transport improvements (at the Thickthorn junction, for instance), the need for various new schools, improved green infrastructure, utilities upgrades and new community facilities. Where particularly relevant (mainly for the larger sites), the need to contribute towards larger pieces of infrastructure is mentioned in individual site policies.

13.2 The JCS provides for a range of improvements required for strategic provisions of transport, green infrastructure and utilities, to be funded by a combination of developer contributions, utility providers, Norfolk County Council and the Highways Agency.

13.3 Site specific mitigation measures were considered as an integral part of assessing the suitability of sites in the Wymondham area. In cases where necessary and appropriate mitigation was not thought to be achievable that site was not allocated. The Pre-submission Wymondham AAP includes policy considerations to address and mitigate identified effects in relation to allocated sites. Such considerations include the requirement for local off-site road improvements, foul and surface water drainage network improvements, the provision of landscaping, the provision of a new school, design requirements for developments to be sympathetic to particular local circumstances. Other mitigations will include potential improvements to bus services through Bus Rapid Transit.

13.4 Although each site’s mitigation requirements differ, common mitigation measures required for allocated sites include elements such as:

- the need for appropriate boundary landscaping on sites which will extend the footprint of a settlement into the countryside to provide a ‘soft’ edge;
- the need for appropriate non-car egress/access to the site, with more general improvements for public transport;
- contributions to maintaining, protecting and improving green infrastructure in and around Wymondham to alleviate potential indirect impacts of housing developments on sites such as Lower Wood, Ashwellthorpe, SSSI
- the need to consider, where relevant (on larger sites only) whether extraction of sand and gravel prior to development taking place is feasible and deliverable.
14. Task B6 – Monitoring of Significant Effects

Under Section 35 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning authorities are required to monitor and report on the implementation of Local Plan policies. The Sustainability Appraisal indicators must also be monitored.

13.2 The three district councils of the GNDP produce a single combined Annual Monitoring Report each year (principally to monitor the Joint Core Strategy), and the monitoring process will involve:

- Comparison of the current state against the baseline;
- Analysis of changes to indicators
- Analysis of performance against targets and objectives.

Table 13.1 describes the envisaged monitoring regime for this SA/SEA:

13.3 The monitoring regime for the Sustainability Appraisal of the Wymondham Area Action Plan will track the same indicators as the other South Norfolk Local Plan Documents (including the Joint Core Strategy).

Table 13.1: Monitoring Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Objectives</th>
<th>SA Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>i) Percentage of SSSIs in favourable condition or unfavourable recovering condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Biodiversity Action Plan habitats/species actions in progress/completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Net change in the number of Tree Preservation Orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Net change in County Wildlife Sites in ‘Positive Conservation Management’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sources: Natural England, Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency and/or NPPF on flood defence grounds (within Flood Zones 2 or 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of dwellings permitted within the high risk flood areas (Flood Zones 2 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sources: Environment Agency and South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ENV 3 | To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change | i) CO$_2$ emissions per capita (million tonnes carbon equivalent)  
ii) Renewable energy capacity permitted by type  

Sources: DECC, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council |
| ENV 4 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | % of residents who travel to work:  
   a) By private motor vehicle  
   b) By public transport  
   c) By foot or cycle  
   d) Work at home or mainly from home  

Source: Census |
| ENV 5 | To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution | Number of designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)  

Source: South Norfolk Council/Norfolk County Council |
| ENV 6 | To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment | i) Number of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments on the Buildings at Risk Register  
ii) Listed Buildings/Scheduled Monuments lost/damaged by development  
iii) Number of Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plans adopted  
iv) Number of TPOs served  

Sources: South Norfolk Council and English Heritage |
| ENV 7 | To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources | i) Percentage of dwellings built on previously developed land  
ii) Percentage of new dwellings completed at  
   a) less than 30 per hectare  
   b) 30-50 per hectare  
   c) More than 50 per hectare  
iii) Loss of Best Most Versatile soils (grades 1, 2 3a)  

Source: South Norfolk Council |
| ENV 8 | To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use | i) Percentage of Broadland catchment river length assessed as good or better:  
   a. Overall Status;  
   b. Ecological Status;  
   c. Biological Status;  
   d. General Physio Chem Status;  
   e. Chemical class  
   ii) Daily domestic water use (per capita consumption)  
   iii) Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality  
   Sources: Environment Agency and Anglian Water |
| ENV 9 | To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling | i) Percentage of household waste recycled/composted  
   ii) Kilograms of waste produced per head of population  
   Source: South Norfolk Council |
| Social Objectives |  |  |
| S 1 | To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home | i) Total and percentage of affordable housing completions  
   ii) Total housing completions  
   Percentage of new public housing stock built to the standard of the Code for Sustainable Homes  
   Source: South Norfolk Council |
| S 2 | To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion | i) Index of Multiple Deprivation score  
   ii) Total and percentage of affordable housing completions  
   % of economically active working age people (aged 16-64) – unemployed  
   Total benefit claimants - percentage of working age people claiming benefits  
   Percentage of people claiming Job Seekers Allowance who have been doing so for a) over 1 year and b) over 2 years  
   Source: Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk Council, NOMIS |
| S 3 | To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment | i) Amount of land development for employment by type  
ii) % of working age (16-64) population economically active  
iii) Gross weekly pay (F/T workers)  
Source: South Norfolk Council and Office for National Statistics, NOMIS |
| S 4 | To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need | % of residents who travel to work:  
a) By private motor vehicle  
b) By public transport  
c) By foot or cycle  
d) Work at home or mainly from home  
Accessibility of local GP services (15 & 30 mins walk/public transport)  
Source: 2011 Census/Norfolk Insight |
| S 5 | To improve the education and skills of the population overall | i) Percentage of school leavers with 5 of more GCSEs A*-C  
ii) Percentage of 16-18 year olds not in employment, education or training (NEETs)  
iii) Proportion of adult population qualified to NVQ4 level or higher  
Source: Norfolk County Council and Department for Children, Schools and Families |
| S 6 | To improve the health of the population overall | Life expectancy at birth and at age 65  
Percentage accessibility of leisure and recreation facilities (by ward)  
Source: South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council and Office for National Statistics |
| S 7 | To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity | Incidents of crime committed  
a) Domestic burglaries  
b) Violence  
c) Offences against vehicles  
Sources: ONS |
| S 8  | To improve the quality of where people live | General resident satisfaction levels  
Source: MORI people survey |

**Economic Objectives**

| EC 1 | To encourage sustained economic growth | i) Amount of land developed for employment use by type  
ii) Employment/unemployment levels  
iii) New business registration rate  
Sources: South Norfolk Council and Office for National Statistics/ NOMIS |

| EC 2 | To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District | i) New business registration rates  
ii) Number of small businesses  
iii) Allocated employment land (ha) without planning permission  
Source: South Norfolk Council and Office for National Statistics |

| EC 3 | To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth | % of residents who travel to work:  
a) By private motor vehicle  
b) By public transport  
c) By foot or cycle  
d) Work at home or mainly from home  
Source: 2011 Census |

| EC 4 | To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy | Proportion of population aged 19-63 for males and 19-59 for females qualified to at least Level 2 or higher  
Source: Audit Commission  
Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area (tonnes/CO2)  
Source: GOV.uk |

| EC 5 | To improve economic performance in rural areas | New business registration rates |
## Appendix 1 – Review of Plans, Programmes and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Relevant key objectives</th>
<th>Relevant key targets and indicators</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Issues for sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rio Earth Summit, 1992 – JCS</td>
<td>• The Convention on Biological Diversity&lt;br&gt;• The Framework Convention on Climate Change&lt;br&gt;• Principles of Forest Management&lt;br&gt;• The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development – 27 key principles&lt;br&gt;• Agenda 21 - an action plan for developing the planet sustainably into the 21st century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto Protocol and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992 – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>To achieve stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at safe levels</td>
<td>UK target is set at 12.5% less than the 1990 output emission levels by 2012. (Domestic goal of 20% reduction of CO2 emissions below 1990 levels by 2010 - Climate Change – UK Programme 2000)</td>
<td>To encourage a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions (directly or through the use of alternatives).</td>
<td>Impact on greenhouse gas emissions Contribution to renewable energy and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora Directive (92/43/EEC) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>To contribute towards ensuring biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna; designation of Special Areas of Conservation. Requirement for “appropriate assessments” to consider effects on sites of European importance.</td>
<td>Protection and management of biodiversity and areas of significant habitat and ecological importance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on habitats and species Development to avoid areas of particular importance Particular consideration of SACs and SPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Air Quality Framework Directive (96/62/EC) (and supplementary ones) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Maintain air quality where it is good, and improve where it is not.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid detrimental impacts on air quality. Help to mitigate in designated Air Quality Management Areas.</td>
<td>Impact on air quality. Need to identify areas where improvement is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC Directive on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (2001/42/EC)</td>
<td>“To provide for a high level of protection of the environment &amp; to contribute to integration of environmental considerations into preparation of plans &amp; programmes …. promoting sustainable development.” “Environmental assessments” should be carried out for plans which are likely to have significant effects on environment.</td>
<td>DPD should be accompanied by SA to ensure: Policies in plan will contribute to sustainable development. That there is full stakeholder &amp; public consultation in process.</td>
<td>SA framework should ensure the objectives of this overarching document are covered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG16 Archaeology and Planning (1993) - JCS</td>
<td>Ensure archaeological remains are not needlessly or thoughtlessly destroyed. Presumption in favour of physical preservation of nationally important remains and their setting.</td>
<td>Consider and address archaeological interests.</td>
<td>Impact on archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (Control of Major Accident Hazards) Regulations (implements obligations under Seveso II Directive Council Directive 96/82/EC) - JCS</td>
<td>Prevent major accidents from hazardous substances &amp; limit their consequences.</td>
<td>Consider location of establishments where hazardous substances are used or stored. Issue of development within vicinity of hazardous substance zones.</td>
<td>Consideration of hazardous substances &amp; impact on health &amp; environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfT 10 year Transport Plan (2000)</td>
<td>To tackle congestion &amp; pollution by improving all types of transport in ways that increase choice. Based on: • integrated transport • public and private partnership • new projects.</td>
<td>Relevant targets: 10% increase in bus journeys to 2010. Bus priority schemes. Improve links to deprived urban areas. More park &amp; ride schemes. Safer cycling &amp; walking routes more 20mph areas &amp; Home Zones.</td>
<td>Promote integrated transport as part of sustainable development.</td>
<td>Contribution to achieving modal shift to sustainable forms of transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban White Paper - Our Towns and Cities: The Future (2000) - JCS</td>
<td>Urban areas that offer a high quality of life and opportunity for all. Urban renaissance should benefit everyone, making towns &amp; cities vibrant &amp; successful, &amp; protecting the countryside from development pressure. Promotes: • Community involvement • Good sustainable design and planning • Prosperous and inclusive cities • Good quality services • Protection from crime</td>
<td>Consider the means for contributing to the environmental, social and economic fabric of the urban area</td>
<td>Contribution to urban environment, economy and social well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG8 Telecommunications (2001) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunication systems whilst keeping environmental impact to a minimum.</td>
<td>Provide for telecomms development, having regard to environmental impacts &amp; technical constraints</td>
<td>Contribution to telecommunications system development and sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG13 Transport (2001) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Promote more sustainable transport choices for people and freight. Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling. Reduce the need to travel, especially by car.</td>
<td>National maximum parking standards (Annex D) Promote development in sustainable locations (good accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport)</td>
<td>Accessibility of development links to jobs, services etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17 Planning for open space, sport and recreation (2002) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Local networks of high quality and well managed and maintained open spaces, sports and recreational facilities and the maintenance of an adequate supply.</td>
<td>Local standards to be set Assess recreational needs, set standards, protect and enhance appropriate provision</td>
<td>Impact / contribution on recreational provision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Strategy 2004 - JCS</td>
<td>Economic and Social Regeneration – Supporting enterprise across rural England, but targeting greater resources at areas of greatest need; Social Justice for All – tackling rural social exclusion and providing fair access to services &amp; opportunities for rural people. Enhancing the countryside – protecting the natural environment.</td>
<td>Consider means for contributing to environmental, social &amp; economic fabric of rural areas.</td>
<td>Contribution to rural environment, economy and social well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS22 Renewable Energy (2004) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Increased development of renewable energy resources</td>
<td>20% of UK electricity to be from renewables by 2020</td>
<td>Promotion of renewable energy. Set criteria for renewable energy projects,</td>
<td>Contribution to renewable energy provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control (2004) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Protecting and improving the natural environment, public health and safety, and amenity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risks / impact from pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (2005) – JCS</td>
<td>Biological and geological diversity are conserved and enhanced as part of sustainable development. Conserve, enhance and restore diversity of wildlife and geology. Contribute to rural renewal and urban renaissance (taking account of biodiversity’s role in quality of life and high quality environments).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify, protect and enhance biodiversity and important geology</td>
<td>Impact on biodiversity (habitats and species) and geology. Contribution to enhancement and restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing the Future - the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 - JCS</td>
<td>A sustainable, innovative &amp; productive economy that delivers high levels of employment &amp; a just society that promotes social inclusion, sustainable communities and personal well-being; done in ways that protect and enhance the physical and natural environment, and use resources and energy as efficiently as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of sustainable economy &amp; communities. Protect &amp; enhance environment, promote resource and energy efficiency.</td>
<td>Contribution to: Economic objectives Sustainable communities Impact on / enhancement of environment Resource efficiency &amp; energy efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) + Supplement Planning &amp; Climate Change (Dec 2006) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Delivery of sustainable development – inc. use of resources and reduction of GHG emissions.&lt;br&gt;Contribute to Climate Change Programme, energy policies and sustainability.&lt;br&gt;Provide homes, jobs, services, infrastructure, reduce emissions, efficient use of resources, resilience to climate change.&lt;br&gt;Deliver sustainable patterns of urban and rural growth, maximising public transport and reducing need to travel (esp. by car).&lt;br&gt;Promote social cohesion &amp; inclusion.&lt;br&gt;Conserve &amp; enhance biodiversity (inc. impacts of climate change)&lt;br&gt;Reflect development needs &amp; interests of community and business. Enable them to contribute effectively. Encourage competitiveness &amp; innovation</td>
<td>Consider how development can contribute towards all aspects of sustainable development, respond to challenges of climate change.</td>
<td>Overall consideration of sustainability and tackling climate change issues e.g. sustainable energy, flooding, biodiversity, locational strategy, accessibility, travel, economic and community development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS3 Housing (2006) - JCS</td>
<td>Ensure that everyone has opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live:&lt;br&gt;To achieve a wide choice of high quality homes, both affordable &amp; market housing, to address community needs.&lt;br&gt;Widen opportunities for home ownership &amp; ensure high quality housing for those who cannot afford market housing, particularly for vulnerable or in need.&lt;br&gt;To improve affordability across housing market, inc. by increasing supply.&lt;br&gt;To create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in both urban &amp; rural areas.</td>
<td>Provide for housing development that is sustainable as regards location, layout &amp; design and meets the needs of the community.</td>
<td>Contribution to meeting housing requirement (market and affordable) sustainability &amp; choice of locations, efficient use and management of land Quality of design, contribution to inclusive communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (May 2006) - JCS</td>
<td>Maximising the economic, social and environmental benefits of tourism, and achieving these in most sustainable manner.</td>
<td>Promote sustainable tourism</td>
<td>Contribution to tourism, impact on economy, environment &amp; social issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Climate Change Programme (latest version March 2006) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Strategy for climate change, reducing emissions that contribute to climate change and adaptation to climate change</td>
<td>Sets out how energy efficiency will save 10.2 million tonnes of carbon (MtC) per year by 2010. Savings will be split between business (5.1MtC) &amp; household (4.8MtC) and public sectors (0.3MtC).</td>
<td>Consider means for reducing emissions and designing/locating development that deals with the risks from climate change</td>
<td>Impact on greenhouse gas emissions. Contribution to renewable energy &amp; efficiency Risks of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Review 2006 - JCS</td>
<td>Tackle climate change by reducing CO2 &amp; to deliver secure, clean energy at affordable prices, as we move to increasing dependence on imported energy</td>
<td>Energy Savings of 6-9 MtC by 2020 (this is on top of savings –12 MtC - announced in the Climate Change Programme of 2006 by 2010)</td>
<td>Promotion of energy efficiency, more efficient transport, distributed energy generation, renewable energy, security of supply.</td>
<td>Contribution to sustainable energy development and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS12 Local Spatial Planning (2008)</td>
<td>Government policies on local spatial planning and LDF preparation. Sets out key ingredients of local spatial planning and how local authorities should prepare them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>To ensure all the requirements of PPS are met through both contents and the procedures plan preparation.</td>
<td>Fundamental tenet of plan preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of the Countryside Report (2008)</td>
<td>Provides information and health check on themes and issues faced by rural communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop plans/proposals that respond to needs of rural communities and countryside issues</td>
<td>Consider contribution towards: Access to services, Sustainable transport, Community involvement, Affordable housing, Environment / countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS25 Development and Flood Risk (2006) + 2009 supplement - JCS</td>
<td>Avoid flood risk where possible (sequential test), manage and reduce risk, avoid increasing flood risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider &amp; limit risks of flooding, avoid locating development in areas at risk where possible, reduce flood-risks.</td>
<td>Risks of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Development (2009)</td>
<td>Proactive and flexible development plan policies that emphasise sustainable development, stresses importance of towns &amp; cities, protecting the countryside but promoting appropriate development in rural areas for employment, tourism &amp; leisure activities (e.g. conversion, re-use and replacement buildings &amp; farm diversification)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive approach towards sustainable economic development – including tourism &amp; leisure. Continued emphasis on town &amp; service centres, protection of countryside and appropriate economic development in rural areas.</td>
<td>Contribution towards economic development in existing centres and rural areas. Provision of jobs &amp; employment opportunities. Sustainability of proposals (re-use, conversions, diversification) Protection of countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)</td>
<td>Recognise that heritage assets are a valuable non-renewable resource.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to consider proposals in light of proximity to historic assets, any impact upon them and with regard to their level of significance.</td>
<td>Contribution to built environment in urban &amp; rural areas. Contributes to distinctiveness of landscape &amp; townscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation draft of PPS 1 supplement: Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate (2010) | Planning should fully support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate by  
  • shaping places to help secure radical cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. This requires the location and layout of new development to be planned to deliver the highest viable energy efficiency, including through the use of decentralized energy, reducing the need to travel, and the fullest possible use of sustainable transport.  
  • actively support and help drive the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy.  
  • shape places and secure new development so as to minimise vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts arising from climate change, and do so in ways consistent with cutting greenhouse gas emissions.  
  • ensure local communities are given real opportunities to take positive action on climate change; in particular by encouraging community-led initiatives to reduce energy use and secure more renewable and low-carbon energy. | | Continued emphasis on low carbon development, renewable energy and imperative need to respond to challenges of climate change | Contribution to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, renewable energy, and impacts of climate change. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</th>
<th>Relevant key objectives</th>
<th>Relevant key targets and indicators</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Issues for sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultation draft of PPS: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment (2010)</td>
<td>Need to conserve &amp; enhance natural environment, inc. quality, character &amp; value of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity &amp; soil within rural &amp; urban areas by ensuring that:&lt;br&gt;— natural environment is integrated into strategic vision of communities&lt;br&gt;— policies &amp; decisions are based on an understanding of the nature, extent &amp; value of the natural environment &amp; recognise its importance; and&lt;br&gt;— development &amp; regeneration has minimal impacts on biodiversity &amp; should enhance it wherever possible to contribute to the overall aim of no net loss to biodiversity.&lt;br&gt; • minimise vulnerability of places, people &amp; wildlife to the impacts of climate change &amp; contribute to effective climate change adaptation measures by maintaining, creating and improving networks of green infrastructure within both urban and rural areas&lt;br&gt; • deliver safe &amp; attractive places to live, which respect the areas character, promote health &amp; wellbeing, &amp; reduce social inequalities by ensuring peoples access to high quality open spaces, green infrastructure &amp; sports &amp; play spaces &amp; facilities which are safely &amp; easily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport&lt;br&gt; • provide access &amp; appropriate recreational opportunities in rural areas to enable urban &amp; rural dwellers to enjoy wider countryside.</td>
<td>Need to ensure up to date data available on natural environment, habitats and green infrastructure and open space etc. when preparing LDF. Need to consider how best to conserve and enhance areas assets and develop strategy to address deficiencies.</td>
<td>Consider impacts upon biodiversity and environmental quality and townscapes/landscapes. Access to environment, promotion of healthy and active populations, provision of high quality local environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Plan: Building for the future – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Ensure all social tenants have a decent home. Ensure all communities have a clean, safe &amp; attractive environment. Ensure that existing housing stock standards are improved. Tackle the housing shortage - more homes of right type in the right place; address the needs for more affordable housing; make best use of existing housing stock. Work towards a better balance in housing market in longer term. Ensure communities are sustainable, the environment is enhanced and countryside protected. Protect the countryside and enhance its quality, avoiding urban sprawl. Address the housing needs of rural communities. Alleviate pressures on services &amp; housing caused by economic success where these pressures cannot readily be dealt with within existing towns and cities. Ensure new &amp; expanded communities are sustainable, well-designed, high quality and attractive places in which people will positively choose to live &amp; work.</td>
<td>Provision of housing for all sectors of the community. Promote good community Environments &amp; improved housing standards. Housing that meets the needs of community, in type &amp; location, whilst protecting environment. Encourage brownfield development. Protect &amp; enhance the countryside. Provide for rural housing needs.</td>
<td>Provision of housing for all sectors of the community. Environmental quality. Housing suitability. Appropriateness of type and sustainability of location. Efficient use/contribution to Environment. Impact on countryside. Meet rural housing needs. Services requirement. Sustainability of policies and proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010</td>
<td>To contribute towards ensuring biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna; designation of Special Areas of Conservation. Requirement for “appropriate assessments” to consider effects on sites of European importance.</td>
<td>Protection and management of biodiversity and areas of significant habitat and ecological importance.</td>
<td>Contribution to: Meet housing requirement. Environmental quality. Housing suitability. Appropriateness of type and sustainability of location. Efficient use/contribution to Environment. Impact on countryside. Meet rural housing needs. Services requirement. Sustainability of policies and proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Impact on habitats and species Development to avoid areas of particular importance. Particular consideration of SACs and SPAs | |
| Impact on habitats and species Development to avoid areas of particular importance. Particular consideration of SACs and SPAs | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Relevant key objectives</th>
<th>Relevant key targets and indicators</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Issues for sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National Planning Policy Framework (2012) | 12 Core Planning Principles:  
  - To be genuinely plan-led empowering local people to shape their surroundings;  
  - Not simply be about scrutiny but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives;  
  - Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development;  
  - Always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity;  
  - Take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting vitality of main urban areas, protecting green belts;  
  - Support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate;  
  - Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution;  
  - Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed;  
  - Promote mixed use developments and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas;  
  - Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance;  
  - Actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling;  
  - Take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all; | Building a strong, competitive economy  
Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
 Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
Promoting sustainable transport  
Supporting high quality communications infrastructure  
Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
Requiring good design  
Promoting healthy communities  
Protecting Green Belt land  
Meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding  
Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
Conserving and enhancing the historic environment | Housing need  
Economic development  
Infrastructure provision  
Conservation of natural environment  
Conservation of the historic environment  
Viability and deliverability |
| Localism Act (2011) | Main measures of the Localism Act:  
  - New freedoms and flexibilities for local government  
  - New rights and powers for communities and individuals  
  - Reform to make the planning system more democratic and more effective  
  - Reform to ensure that decisions about housing are taken locally | Abolition of regional strategies  
A Duty to Cooperate  
Neighbourhood Planning  
Neighbourhood Development Orders  
Community right to build  
Requirement for developers to consult local communities  
Reform the way local plans are made | Housing targets  
Duty to Cooperate  
Neighbourhood Plans |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</th>
<th>Relevant key objectives</th>
<th>Relevant key targets and indicators</th>
<th>Implications for LDF appraisal</th>
<th>Issues for sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Sustainable Development Framework for the East of England (EERA, 2001) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>High level objectives: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth. To deliver more sustainable patterns of location of development, including employment and housing. To protect and maintain our most valuable regional assets such as designated habitats, landscapes of natural beauty, and our historic built heritage, and to improve the wider environment by means of adequate investment and management. To reduce our consumption of fossil fuels. To achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society &amp; fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas in the region. To use natural resources (finite &amp; Renewable) efficiently as possible, re-use or recycled alts wherever possible. Minimise production of by-products or wastes, aiming for &quot;closed systems&quot;. To avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life (eg. dependence on unsustainably produced and/or transported food imports or timber). To revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living.</td>
<td>Promote sustainable development, inc. location &amp; urban living. Protect and enhance environmental assets. Promote resource and energy efficiency. Improve access to jobs, services &amp; facilities.</td>
<td>Sustainability of development. Impact on environment. Impact on resources. Contribution to energy efficiency &amp; renewable energy. Accessibility of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland for Life – Regional Woodland strategy for the East of England (Nov. 2003) – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Improve the lives of individuals and the places in which they live and work. Add to general economy of region, with woodland economy providing wide range of social &amp; environmental benefits. The use of wood as an alternative source of energy to fossil fuels. Deliver wider societal benefits using woodlands as resources for learning. A high quality natural environment that is protected and enhanced.</td>
<td>Consider the retention and enhancement of woodland for its contribution to social, economic &amp; environmental factors</td>
<td>Impact on, or contribution to enhancement of, woodlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority Health Strategy 2005 – 2010 - JCS | Vision  
People choosing healthier lifestyles.  
People fully involved in decisions about their healthcare.  
Better quality care, with safe, more effective treatment tailored to the individual.  
Services delivered locally with more support at home & in community & less time in hospital.  
Improved health outcomes for vulnerable groups and reduced inequalities.  
Efficient and effective use of available resources to deliver sustainable services.                                                                                       | Consider the issue of promoting healthier lifestyles and provision of facilities                                                                              | Contribution to healthy lifestyles and provision of facilities                                      |                                     |
| Living with Climate Change in the East of England – EoEP & JCS                  | Key messages:  
By planning ahead we can avoid the worst impacts & take advantage of opportunities.  
Climate change will create opportunities as well as threats eg tourism.  
Business activity will be significantly affected.  
The “northern heartland”, which includes the Greater Norwich Area, is the least vulnerable area in the East of England (with fluvial flooding and agricultural impacts likely being the most significant impacts).  
Planning policies should influence the location and design of new buildings to minimise vulnerability to climate change.  
Address impacts on economic development.  
Adapt properties to make them more resilient to flood damage and ensure siting does not exacerbate flood risk. Improve ventilation, cooling and shading in properties.  
Include Water conservation measures.  
Create well-shaded green spaces.                                                                                       | Consider and limit risks of flooding.  
Promote good design that addresses climate change (eg flood risk, ventilation, shading).                                                                                                               | Risks of flooding.  
Contribution to quality of design / sustainable construction.                                                                                                      |                                     |
Improve health, well-being, education & skills, cohesive communities and access to jobs & services.  
Ability to live in decent home.                                                                                     |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Relevant key objectives</th>
<th>Relevant key targets and indicators</th>
<th>Implications for LDF</th>
<th>Issues for sustainability appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water resources for the future: a strategy for the Anglian Region – EoEP &amp; JCS</td>
<td>Abstraction of water that is environmentally &amp; economically sustainable, providing right amount of water for people, agriculture, commerce and industry &amp; an improved water-related environment.</td>
<td>Availability of water supply. Limit impacts on the water resource.</td>
<td>Impact on water resource (supply and environment)</td>
<td>Contribution to water efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland Rivers Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy – JCS</td>
<td>Manage water to ensure that it is available for abstraction whilst protecting the needs of the natural environment</td>
<td>Consider the implications for the water resource.</td>
<td>Impacts on water resource (supply and environment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadland Rivers Catchment Flood Management Plan - JCS</td>
<td>Reduce flood risk to people, especially vulnerable groups, property and infrastructure. Reduce risk to life from flooding. Reduce disruption to major transport links, essential infrastructure &amp; communities. Restore, protect and where possible improve nature conservation sites of international importance. Protect and where possible improve recreation and fisheries resources. Extend navigation where appropriate. Protect and improve sustainable water abstraction schemes. Maintain and increase connectivity of the river and floodplain. Restore new areas of functional flood plain and improve in-stream features. Meet river quality objectives and standards. Protect designated cultural heritage features from flooding, where possible.</td>
<td>Consider the implications of flood risk for development, avoiding risks where possible and enabling improvements</td>
<td>Risks of flooding. Contribution to reducing risks and impacts of flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Corporate Equality Plan (2003) - JCS</td>
<td><strong>AIMING FOR EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY</strong> &quot;Putting People First&quot; ensure that views &amp; priorities of all citizens are reflected in Council policies. Aim to ensure that equality included in day-to-day work delivering services &amp; in our role as employer. To achieve that, the Council will: Make our services &amp; information about them accessible to all. Ensure, where appropriate, that we work in partnership with others to deliver equality. Meet our statutory requirements. Ensure that employees are treated fairly. Ensure policy development &amp; planning recognise importance of equalities.</td>
<td>Reflect equalities issues</td>
<td>Contribution to equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Empty Homes Strategy (2003) - JCS</td>
<td>Objectives and targets - bringing empty homes back into productive use for benefit of South Norfolk’s residents will assist in: Reduce number of unfit dwellings. Contribute to revitalisation of market towns. Increasing supply of affordable housing. Increase provision of rented properties for those without homes.</td>
<td>Contribution to housing provision</td>
<td>Contribution to providing everybody with opportunity of a decent home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Biodiversity Action Plan 2004 - JCS</td>
<td>Conservation of species and habitats in Norfolk, inc. action plans</td>
<td>Protect and enhance the natural environment (habitats and species)</td>
<td>Impact on biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity SPG for Norfolk (2004)</td>
<td>Need to consider biodiversity issues as integral &amp; at earliest stage of planning e.g. site species/habitat surveys. Gives advice on protection, enhancement &amp; mitigation.</td>
<td>Opportunities for species protection &amp; habitat creation &amp; enhancement.</td>
<td>Consider impacts on biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Broads Plan 2004 - JCS</td>
<td>The Broads will be promoted as national park, accessible to people of all abilities &amp; social backgrounds to enjoy in quiet &amp; environmentally sustainable ways that are in keeping with its distinctive natural &amp; cultural beauty &amp; that are appropriate to a nationally &amp; internationally protected area. Tranquillity &amp; wildness of area protected &amp; enhanced. Information will be readily accessible. Tourism will be of a high standard, contributing to local communities etc. Water resources will be managed sustainably to ensure the proper functioning of the wetland system. Archaeological features will be identified and safeguarded; the Broads distinctiveness will be restored, enhanced &amp; protected; good design &amp; sustainable construction will be encouraged. Waterways will be maintained &amp; enhanced. Land-based access protected &amp; enhanced. Precautionary measures will be taken to prevent environmental degradation. Management will be informed by scientific knowledge. Economic &amp; social development will focus on sustaining thriving rural communities through key sectors e.g. tourism, marine industry &amp; agriculture. Impacts of climate change will be managed sustainably over the longer term. The flood plain will be managed sustainably to alleviate flooding in the Broads.</td>
<td>Consider the implications of potential effects on the Broads Area &amp; contributions to the achievement of the Broads Plan</td>
<td>Impacts on the Broads Area &amp; its management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Tourism Strategy (2004) - JCS</td>
<td>Plan to achieve: 1. Increase income from tourism. 2. We will encourage more accommodation providers &amp; attractions to meet quality standards with a series of initiatives 3. The South Norfolk tourism profile will be improved to increase the number of visitors. 4. Responding to the industry’s requests, partners will promote schemes to extend the season, retain skills &amp; encourage investment 5. Involve all tourism partnerships &amp; communities in marketing of destinations, events &amp; themes in South Norfolk. 6. Help local tourism businesses to promote &amp; identify themselves to public. Development of tourism in South Norfolk will enhance the natural and built environment.</td>
<td>Reflect locations of tourist activities. Built &amp; natural environment is key factor.</td>
<td>Contribution to sustained economic growth. Contribution to maintaining &amp; enhancing distinctiveness &amp; quality of landscapes &amp; townscapes. Contribution to conserving &amp; enhancing historic environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsies and Travellers Strategy for Norfolk (2005-2008) - JCS</td>
<td>A Norfolk where Gypsies &amp; Travellers have equality of opportunity with other communities to enable them to access services provided by agencies working together in an inclusive, cohesive &amp; transparent manner.</td>
<td>Address the identified need of Gypsy and Traveller communities</td>
<td>Reduction of social exclusion &amp; contribution to quality of life for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Stronger Communities: South Norfolk’s Strategy for Community Cohesion (Oct 2006) - JCS</td>
<td>Everyone has sense of belonging &amp; shares common values Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities Diversity of people’s backgrounds &amp; circumstances is appreciated &amp; valued. Mutual respect for differing opinions &amp; views Strong &amp; positive relationships are being developed from different backgrounds.</td>
<td>Consider issue of community cohesion &amp; social inclusion</td>
<td>Contribution to local community identity, good behaviour &amp; co-operative attitudes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Plan for Norfolk 2006 – 2011 (inc. Transport Strategy to 2021) - JCS</td>
<td>Improve strategic accessibility to reduce Remoteness &amp; improve economic performance. Reduce need to travel by balancing jobs &amp; housing growth. Improve connections by road &amp; particularly public transport. Make house &amp; jobs growth more sustainable, by locating it to minimise need to travel, especially by car. Improve local connections &amp; promote better accessibility to jobs &amp; services, especially by public transport, cycling &amp; walking. Prioritise improvements in more deprived areas. Reduce delays to people &amp; traffic + focus interventions on worst congestion areas - by improving efficiency of transport network &amp; reducing car use. Reduce emissions by enabling a shift to alternative fuels &amp; low emission vehicles. Protect the environment. Reduce casualties. Increase focus on safer road user behaviour. Reduce danger for cyclists &amp; pedestrians. Recognises Norwich area as a focus for growth. Supports Norwich’s role as a Regional Interchange Centre and role of market towns; links between Norwich &amp; market towns being of particular importance. Within the built up area, the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy is carried forward, including extending pedestrian dominated area of city-centre + promoting travel choice &amp; accessibility into &amp; within area by all modes. Recognises role of market towns as service centres. Will seek to: Improve role as interchange centres &amp; within towns, improve walking &amp; cycling. Remove traffic from town centres where possible, promote vibrant public spaces &amp; thriving local economies to serving rural hinterland. Proposed major schemes include Norwich Northern Distributor Road.</td>
<td>Consider need for strategic transport improvements related to development. Consider accessibility for development &amp; need for local transport improvements. Focus development on accessible locations where need to travel is reduced, providing for transport improvements where necessary. Reduce need for travel. Require road safety measures / improvements where appropriate. Provide for / require necessary transport infrastructure improvements. Provide for / require necessary transport infrastructure improvements. Provide for strategic transport infrastructure.</td>
<td>Accessibility of development / location and links to jobs and services. Impact on road safety. Contribution to transport infrastructure. Contribution to strategic transport infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy for Norfolk 2006 – 2020 - JCS</td>
<td>To reduce the growth in municipal waste by promoting waste reduction and reuse initiatives; Promote waste awareness through public education &amp; awareness campaigns; Increase recycling &amp; composting of waste to achieve statutory performance standards &amp; national recycling and recovery standards; Progressively increase the recovery &amp; diversion of biodegradable waste from landfill in accordance with Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme; Deliver an efficient, effective &amp; affordable waste management service that promotes the implementation of the most practical, social, environmental &amp; economically acceptable solutions; Procure appropriate technologies to manage &amp; treat residual municipal waste; Ensure that way residual waste is treated will support practices higher up waste hierarchy; Minimise as far as possible the residual waste requiring treatment &amp; final disposal; Norfolk Authorities will work together to achieve the Objectives and Actions within the waste management strategy.</td>
<td>Improve the rates of waste recovery and recycling and re-use. To reduce the amount of waste produced at the beginning of the waste chain. To ensure that waste collections and treatment processes are sustainable and able to cater for the new growth from housing and employment. To utilise the waste treatment process as an important opportunity for employment generation.</td>
<td>To improve environmental amenity, including air quality; To make the best use of resources, including land and energy and to minimise waste production; To offer more opportunities for rewarding and satisfying employment for all; To improve the quality of where people live; To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability Employment Plan for Norfolk (2007) - JCS</td>
<td>People with learning difficulties should have same access to employment as others. People with learning difficulties should be supported to have a job and a career. There should be services to support people with learning difficulties to gain a job or job related activities as they want. People, their carers, families, friends &amp; supporters of those with learning difficulties should have the right information about different ways of getting a job, benefits &amp; who can help. Employers and services should be given support &amp; good information so that they can work together to get more people into real jobs. Employment should be seen as a key issue for growing up amongst people with learning difficulties.</td>
<td>Norfolk LAA target is 11% reduction in CO2 emissions across Norfolk by 2011. LAA target to reach Level 3 by 2011.</td>
<td>Address identified needs of people with learning difficulties and their support networks.</td>
<td>Reduction of social exclusion &amp; contribution to quality of life for all. Contribution to economic provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership of Norfolk Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008)</td>
<td>Ensure flood risk is taken into account at all stages in the planning process to avoid inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding &amp; directing development away from high risk areas. Provides advice on likely impacts of climate change &amp; areas of SuDS applicability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the implications of flood risk for development, avoid allocations in areas at risk of flooding. Promote water efficiency &amp; use of SuDS.</td>
<td>Need to avoid, reduce &amp; manage flood risk now &amp; with regard to climate change. Promote water efficiency &amp; use of SuDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (publication document November 2009, adopted March 2011)</td>
<td>Sets out long-term development strategy &amp; policies for South Norfolk, Broadland and Norwich City Councils up to 2026.</td>
<td>Identify sites for at least 47,500 new homes between 2001 &amp; 2026. Target for growth in employment to provide 33,000 new jobs between 2008 &amp; 2026.</td>
<td>Site Specific DPD will define growth locations identified in JCS including site allocations/designations &amp; policies. Site Specific DPD must be in conformity with Core Strategy.</td>
<td>SA objectives from JCS relevant &amp; need to be translated, where appropriate to consideration of Site Specific issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Norwich Development Partnership Green Infrastructure Strategy (2007) and Delivery Plan (2009)</td>
<td>Strategy for green infrastructure to complement housing &amp; economic growth by providing high quality, accessible green infrastructure within a comprehensive landscape structure; promoting ecological networks &amp; continuity &amp; links between habitats; improving quality of life; helping to address climate change; improving access to habitats &amp; green space &amp; encouraging community well being.</td>
<td>Maximise opportunities for strategic &amp; local green infrastructure. Protect &amp; enhance existing sites, creating new sites &amp; new linkages. Promote biodiversity, public access &amp; health benefits arising from Green Infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution towards biodiversity, green infrastructure, public access, environmental improvements/protection &amp; health benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Alliance Sustainable Community Strategy - JCS</td>
<td>Vision: Healthier &amp; even safer place to live, where crime levels &amp; fear of crime are low. Education, support &amp; care are available for all.</td>
<td>Provide for housing requirements – for all sectors of community, in suitable locations.</td>
<td>Contribution to housing provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes and Housing: Increase no. of affordable properties, inc. shared ownership. Achieve high standard of design &amp; efficient use of resources in developments.</td>
<td>Development of the economy: Improve availability of jobs &amp; ability of people to get them. Develop village &amp; rural economy.</td>
<td>Contribution to economic development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximise use of cycling as convenient, attractive, safe &amp; healthy &amp; secure means of transport &amp; to integrate with other modes.</td>
<td>Encourage cycling &amp; provision for cyclists needs.</td>
<td>Contribution to accessibility &amp; sustainable transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime and community safety: Reduce crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour &amp; fear of crime.</td>
<td>Maximise provision of convenient, safe &amp; attractive cycle routes &amp; parking.</td>
<td>To integrate provisions for cycles with other forms of transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people: Tackle issues inc. lack of transport &amp; leisure facilities, rural isolation, boredom &amp; difficulty in accessing leisure facilities.</td>
<td>Encourage cycling &amp; provision for cyclists needs.</td>
<td>Contribution to accessibility &amp; sustainable transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Cycling Strategy - JCS</td>
<td>Vision: Maximise use of cycling as convenient, attractive, safe &amp; healthy &amp; secure means of transport &amp; to integrate with other modes.</td>
<td>Encourage cycling &amp; provision for cyclists needs.</td>
<td>Contribution to accessibility &amp; sustainable transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community life: Locate most new development where people have easy access to their essential needs &amp; reduce need to travel. Promote social inclusion.</td>
<td>Encourage cycling &amp; provision for cyclists needs.</td>
<td>Contribution to accessibility &amp; sustainable transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes and Housing: Increase no. of affordable properties, inc. shared ownership. Achieve high standard of design &amp; efficient use of resources in developments.</td>
<td>Development of the economy: Improve availability of jobs &amp; ability of people to get them. Develop village &amp; rural economy.</td>
<td>Contribution to economic development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title (sorted by publication date)</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF appraisal</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Local Agenda 21 Strategy - JCS</td>
<td>Promote Economic Success. Create vibrant local economy giving access to satisfying &amp; rewarding work without damaging environment. Value unpaid work. Meet Social Needs. Protect human health &amp; amenity through safe, clean, pleasant environments. Emphasise health service prevention action as well as care 65% Maximise access to skills &amp; knowledge. Ensure access to good food, water, housing &amp; fuel at reasonable cost. Encourage access to facilities, services, goods &amp; other people in ways which make less use of car &amp; minimise impacts on environment. Culture, leisure &amp; recreation available to all. Meet local needs locally. Make settlements 'human' in scale &amp; form. Value &amp; protect diversity &amp; distinctiveness, strengthen community &amp; cultural identity, Protect &amp; enhance environment. Use energy, water &amp; other natural resources efficiently &amp; with care. Minimise waste, re-use or recover through recycling, composting or energy recovery. Limit pollution to levels which do not damage natural systems. Value &amp; protect the diversity of nature</td>
<td>Various issues to be reflected in LDD policy</td>
<td>Contribution to local economy. Maintain &amp; improve population health. Improving education &amp; skills of population. Encourage local community identity, good behaviour &amp; co-operative attitudes. Opportunities for population to have rewarding &amp; satisfying employment. Quality of where people live. Accessibility to essential services &amp; facilities Reduce effect of traffic on environment. Maintaining &amp; enhancing biodiversity, geodiversity. Maintaining &amp; enhancing distinctiveness &amp; quality of landscapes &amp; townscores. Provision for sustainable use &amp; sources of water supply contribution to minimising production of waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Relevant key objectives</td>
<td>Relevant key targets and indicators</td>
<td>Implications for LDF</td>
<td>Issues for sustainability appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Ambition (Norfolk Community Strategy) – JCS</td>
<td>To improve the quality of life for all the people of Norfolk. Key themes being: Individuals have the opportunity to achieve a good quality of life. Healthy lifestyles &amp; access to health &amp; social care. People feel safe. Educational attainment and opportunities for learning throughout life. All can play an active part in community life. Environment is respected and enhanced, including renewable energies. Culture, creativity and spirituality. Distinctive economy. Physical &amp; virtual comms. infrastructure.</td>
<td>Maintain and enhance the elements that contribute to the quality of life of residents</td>
<td>Contribution to or impact on quality of life elements: health, safety, educational attainment, community life, environment, culture, economy, communications infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping the Future - an economic strategy for Norfolk and Waveney, and a social cohesion strategy for Norfolk - JCS</td>
<td>Increase wealth creation by building a dynamic and supportive environment for business and enable our people to participate in the economy and maximise their potential whilst ensuring that we protect and enhance our physical environment. 5 Social cohesion themes - access, sustainable jobs, employment and personnel practices, community development, young people's needs.</td>
<td>Raise annual average rate of growth from projected 2.1 % to 2.5%. Create by 2007 an additional 11,000 above the projected figure of 348,000 Reduce unemployment to 1% below UK national average.</td>
<td>Encourage employment development in appropriate locations.</td>
<td>Contribution to economic provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2 – Baseline Information for South Norfolk SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV 1</th>
<th>% of SSSIs in ‘favourable’ or ‘unfavourable recovering’ condition</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Source: Natural England                                      | 2011/12 – 86%       | 2008/09 – 33%  
2009/10 – 40%  
2010/11 – 86%  
2011/12 – 86% | England  
2013 – 96.21%  
[sssi.naturalengland.org.uk - sssi report](https://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk) | Increase | Could consider developing indicators around:  
- candidate RIGS sites once NGP work complete  
- BAP habitats (dependent upon NBP resources) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV 1</th>
<th>Net change in County Wildlife Sites in “Positive Conservation Management”</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Source: South Norfolk AMR                                                   | 2011/12 – 56%       | 2008/09 – 44%  
2009/10 – 48%  
2010/11 – 55%  
2011/12 – 56% | 2011-12:  
GNDP Area – 60%  
Broadland – 64%  
Norwich – 79% | Increase | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV 2</th>
<th>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flood risk</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Source: South Norfolk AMR                                                                   | 2011/12             | 2008/09 – 2  
2009/10 – 0  
2010/11 – 0  
2011/12 – Not Available | Not applicable      | Zero     | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV 3</th>
<th>Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area (tonnes/CO2)</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Source: GOV.UK                                      | 2011 – 7.3          | Baseline – Per Capita Emissions (t)  
8.8 tonnes CO2 (2006)  
2007 – 8.6  
2008 – 8.5  
2009 – 7.7  
2010 – 7.9 | 2011:  
Broadland – 7.1  
Norwich – 5.7 | decrease | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV 4</th>
<th>Renewable energy generating capacity installed (MW)</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | Source: South Norfolk AMR                           | 2012 – 5.805 MW     | 2010 – 3.84  
### Appendix 2 – Baseline Information for South Norfolk SA Objective

| ENV 4 | % of residents who travel to work:  
| Base figure, 2011 Census | Trends | Comparison Value | Target | Comments |
|-------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|----------|
| a) by private motor vehicle | a) 71.65% (43,233) | Base figure, 2011 | Norfolk2001 | a) Increased |
| b) by public transport | b) 5.9% (3574) | 67.3% | b) Increased |
| c) by foot or cycle | c) 8.5% (1841 cycle, 3284 foot) | 5.7% | b) Increased |
| d) work at home or mainly from home | d) 13.4% (8065) | 16.3% | c) Decreased |
| **Source:** 2011 Census | | 14.7% | c) Decreased |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV 5</th>
<th>No. of designated Air Quality Management Areas</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of areas where NO2 above 40µg/m3</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>No. of areas where further air quality investigation being undertaken</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>Net decrease for a) and b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of areas where further air quality investigation being undertaken</td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> South Norfolk Air Quality Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ENV 6 | Number of heritage assets at risk e.g.  
<p>| 2008/9 a) 42 | Trends | Comparison Value | Target | Comments |
|-------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|----------|
| No. of areas | 2007/8 a) 0/-4 | | | | |
| a) Listed Buildings | | | | | |
| b) Scheduled Ancient Monuments added/removed from Buildings at Risk register | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Number of Conservation Area Character Appraisal &amp; Management Plans adopted (0/52) | Total = 52 | Trends | Comparison Value | Target | Comments |
| 2008 – 12 | 2008/12 – 12 | 2012 – 17 | N/a | Not applicable | 52/52 |
| 2009/10 – 6 | 2009/10 – 6 | 2010/11 – 10 | N/a | Not applicable | 52/52 |
| Number of TPOs served | Source: South Norfolk AMR | | | | |
| 2011/12 – 8 | 2009/10 – 6 | 2010/11 – 10 | Not applicable | 52/52 |
| Status of national landscape character areas | | | | | |
| No. applications where ENV1 reason for refusal | Maintained | 1990-98: | Not applicable | Maintain/enhance |
| | Not available | Not available | Not available | Maintain/enhance |
| | | | | To be determined |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SA Objective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Trends</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comparison Value</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ENV 7** % of new dwellings built on previously developed land | 2011/12 – 25% | 2008/09 – 38%  
2009/10 – 32%  
2010/11 – 29% | 2011/12 Broadland – 57%  
Norwich – 90% | Decrease |
| **ENV 8** Daily domestic water use – per capita consumption | No data available | 2005/6 – 144  
2006/7 – 146 | GNDP area  
2008/9 – 148.1  
2009/10 – 142.7  
2010/11 – 144.5 | Data not available at district level. Figures refer to Norwich and the Broads water resource Zone with provides the most appropriate proxy area |
| **S 1** Affordable housing completions/year | 2010/11 - NDA | 2007/8 – 3  
2008/9 – 2  
2009/10 -0 | GNDP 2007/8 – 4  
2008/9 – 4  
2009/10 - 1 | Zero |
| **S 2** Number of Super Output Areas in most deprived 10% of England. Source: Norfolk Insight | Zero | None | Not applicable | Maintain |
| **S 3** % of economically active working age people (aged 16-64) - Unemployed | 2011 – 1.5% | 2007 – 3.4%  
2008 – 4.0%  
2009 – 4.2% | Norfolk  
2009 – 5.19%  
2011 – 2.5% | Decrease |
## Appendix 2 – Baseline Information for South Norfolk SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S 3</strong></td>
<td>% of working age (16-64) population economically active</td>
<td>2012/2013 – 88.9%&lt;br&gt;Base fig 70,300</td>
<td>2007 – 85.5%&lt;br&gt;2008 – 80.1%&lt;br&gt;2009 – 80.38%</td>
<td>Norfolk 2009 – 80.91%&lt;br&gt;2012/13 – 78.6%&lt;br&gt;77.1%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S 4</strong></td>
<td>% of residents who travel to work:&lt;br&gt;a) by private motor vehicle&lt;br&gt;b) by public transport&lt;br&gt;c) by foot or cycle&lt;br&gt;d) work at home or mainly from home</td>
<td>Base fig 60,333&lt;br&gt;a) 71.65% (43,233)&lt;br&gt;b) 5.9% (3574)&lt;br&gt;c) 8.5% (1841 cycle, 3284 foot)&lt;br&gt;d) 13.4% (8065)</td>
<td>2001 census&lt;br&gt;a) 70.82%&lt;br&gt;b) 5.15%&lt;br&gt;c) 9.82%&lt;br&gt;d) 12.02%</td>
<td>Base figure, 2011 census&lt;br&gt;Norfolk 2001&lt;br&gt;a) 65.4%&lt;br&gt;b) 4.8%&lt;br&gt;c) 16.3%&lt;br&gt;d) 10.8%</td>
<td>a) Increase&lt;br&gt;b) Increase&lt;br&gt;c) Decrease&lt;br&gt;d) Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility of local GP services (15 &amp; 30 mins walk/public transport)</td>
<td>2009&lt;br&gt;15mins – 65.63%&lt;br&gt;30mins – 94.32%</td>
<td>Norfolk(2009)&lt;br&gt;15mins – 72.42%&lt;br&gt;30mins – 96.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S 5</strong></td>
<td>% of working age population with qualifications at NVQ 4 or above</td>
<td>2012 – 34.1%</td>
<td>2005 – 27.4%&lt;br&gt;2006 – 33.2%&lt;br&gt;2007 – 29.0%&lt;br&gt;2008 – 26.5%</td>
<td>East of England 2005 – 25.0%&lt;br&gt;2006 – 25.0%&lt;br&gt;2007 – 26.0%&lt;br&gt;2008 – 26.1%&lt;br&gt;2012 – 32.9%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of 16 year old with 5 or more GCSEs grade A-C</td>
<td>Base Education</td>
<td>2004/5 – 52.6&lt;br&gt;2009 – 50.0%&lt;br&gt;2010 – 52.3%&lt;br&gt;2011 – 55.4%&lt;br&gt;2012 – 55.6%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trends
- **2007**
  - Working age economically active: 85.5%
  - Gross weekly pay: £431.1
- **2008**
  - Working age economically active: 80.1%
  - Gross weekly pay: £438.5
- **2009**
  - Working age economically active: 80.38%
  - Gross weekly pay: £464.5
- **2012**
  - Working age economically active: 78.6%
  - Gross weekly pay: £508

### Comparison Value
- **Norfolk**
  - 2009: 80.91%
  - 2012/13: 78.6%

### Comments
- Increase
- Increase
- Increase
- Decrease

---

*Source: NOMIS, 2011 Census, Norfolk Insight, Department of Education.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 2 – Baseline Information for South Norfolk SA Objective</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 6 Life expectancy, at birth, of</td>
<td>2008 - 2010</td>
<td>2005-7</td>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) males</td>
<td>a) 80.7</td>
<td>a) 79.5</td>
<td>A 2005/07 – 78.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) females</td>
<td>b) 83.2</td>
<td>b) 83.3</td>
<td>B 2007/09 – 79.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009/11 – 79.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 7 Incidences of crime committed</td>
<td>12 months to Sept 13</td>
<td>Same 12 month</td>
<td>12 Months to March</td>
<td>A- Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Domestic burglaries</td>
<td>a) 171</td>
<td>period last year</td>
<td>Norfolk / 1000 Population (HMIC)</td>
<td>B- Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violence</td>
<td>b) 798</td>
<td>a) 168</td>
<td>A – 1.6</td>
<td>C- Decrease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Offences against vehicles</td>
<td>c) 310</td>
<td>b) 645</td>
<td>B – 9.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) 375</td>
<td>C – 3.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8 General resident satisfaction levels</td>
<td>2008/9 91%</td>
<td>2006/7 90%</td>
<td>National 86%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: MORI people survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: NOMIS</td>
<td>2009 – 450</td>
<td>2009 – 450</td>
<td>Norfolk – 495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 – 350</td>
<td>2010 – 350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 – Baseline Information for South Norfolk SA Objective

### EC 2
Allocated employment land (Ha) without planning permission (COI BD3)
Source: South Norfolk AMR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 – 95.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Norfolk currently has 104.7 hectares of available employment land (17% of the county total): 8% has associated planning permission; 1% is currently under construction leaving 91% without any form of permission. If average take up (4.5 hectares per annum) were to continue in the district, all employment land will be taken up in 23 years. Ref. NCC Employment Land Monitoring Report. 2011/12. <a href="http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC122493">http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/view/NCC122493</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EC 3
% of residents who travel to work:
  a) by private motor vehicle
  b) by public transport
  c) by foot or cycle
  d) work at home or mainly from home
Source: 2011 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base fig 60,333</th>
<th>2001 census</th>
<th>2011 census</th>
<th>a) Increased</th>
<th>b) Increased</th>
<th>c) Decreased</th>
<th>d) Increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) 70.82%</td>
<td>a) 65.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) 5.15%</td>
<td>b) 4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) 9.82%</td>
<td>c) 16.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) 12.02%</td>
<td>d) 10.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average distance travelled to work by residents
Source: National Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16km</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>East of England</th>
<th>15.8km</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>15.8km</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>15.8km</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 2001 figures available RD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 2 – Baseline Information for South Norfolk SA Objective</th>
<th>South Norfolk Value</th>
<th>Trends</th>
<th>Comparison Value</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Consultation comments received on the Sustainability Appraisal and the Council’s responses

### Scoping Report comments (2010)

| Organisation                  | Summary of representation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Response                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Norfolk Wildlife Trust        | Satisfied that the issues relevant to their area of interest are covered in the report.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Noted.                                                                                               |
| Norfolk County Council        | Amend reference to Greater Norwich Housing Market Assessment on page 8 to include November 2009 update.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Agree. Make amendment as suggested.                                                                ettel |
| Norfolk County Council        | Clarification provided re: Norfolk Historic Environment Record (NHER) sites on page 13. A high number of records does not indicate that there is necessarily greater historical interest in that area, only that it has hitherto been investigated more thoroughly. Additionally, all listed buildings and scheduled monuments are included on the NHER, so the report may have double counted these assets. Otherwise, inclusion of the significance of the wider historic landscape is very welcome. | Agree. Amend NHER reference in table on page 13 to “sites of local archaeological interest” and change figure to 2875.                                                                                                                                   |
| Norfolk County Council        | Suggest page 14 also refers to County-run facilities, in particular that the County Council provides four Household Waste Recycling Centres within South Norfolk. It is suggested that the reduction of waste should be included.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Agree. Refer to four County-run Household Waste Recycling Centres on page 14. Include reduction of waste under ‘climate change’ on page 38.                                                                 |

**NB:** Page numbers referred to are those in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report as presented to Cabinet on 12th July 2010
within ‘climate change’ on page 38.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norfolk County Council</th>
<th>Suggest that ENV6 (Appendix Two) include an attribute related to landscape. An appropriate attribute may be to monitor the status of the national landscape character areas - these are already monitored through the Countryside Quality Counts programme.</th>
<th>Agree. Include suggested indicator &amp; also no. of planning apps where South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) policy ENV1 ‘Protection of landscape’ is reason for refusal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council</td>
<td>Suggest reference re: need for developer funding for the sustainable provision of facilities and infrastructure at district and county level. This could be inserted within Task 3 Sustainability Issues (Access to Services; Leisure, Culture and Recreation; Education; Transport and Accessibility; and Transport Infrastructure) or within Task 4.</td>
<td>Agree. Include reference within suggested sections of Task 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE (Norfolk)</td>
<td>No comment on whether all relevant plans, policies and programmes included. Baseline information seems to cover appropriate areas but much of it is based on Regional Spatial Strategy figures etc. Most of sustainability issues identified but there are conflicting aspirations and potential for contradiction e.g. high level of growth &amp; desire to protect and enhance character of area. SA objectives cover range of aims but same conflict as above e.g. ENV5 seeks to “minimise noise, vibration and light pollution” very much doubt this will be case once the 32,000 homes identified in Joint Core Strategy achieved.</td>
<td>Note the points raised and acknowledge potential conflicts re: growth vs. environmental protection. However, it is the role of the SA to highlight such issues so that they can be taken into account during policy development and decision-making. The potential to review the housing figures/targets falls outside of the remit of this scoping report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
review its housing figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East of England Development Agency (EEDA)</th>
<th>Suggest need more evidence to cover broader sustainable economic development in East of England and on socio-economic factors to cover:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the need for the development scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the wider socio-economic benefits and costs (including an analysis of additionality – the added value generated by the scheme, taking account value that would have happened without the scheme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an analysis of alternative options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusion of appropriate headline regional ambitions from *The Regional Economic Strategy (Inventing our Future – Collective action for a sustainable economy, 2008)* from the suggestions (below)

**Productivity and prosperity**
- Annual growth in real workplace-based GVA over 2008 – 2031
  - Per capita at 2.3 per cent
  - Per worker at 2.1 per cent

**Conventional economic impacts (GDP £)**
- *Wider economic impacts (all GDP £)*
  - Agglomeration
  - Imperfect competition
  - Labour market impacts

**Employment**
- Employment rate by 2031
- Working-age population at 80 per cent

The relative social, economic and environmental implications of development/policies will be assessed via the SA. The ‘need’ for a scheme can be included as part any assessment. No change.

The opportunity to assess the wider socio-economic benefits and costs can be included within the existing SA framework – No change.

One of the main purposes of the SA is to assess and compare the options available. No change.

**Productivity and prosperity**, **Conventional economic impacts and Wider economic impacts** – No change. The SA is not intended to act as a detailed economic activity monitor rather it is an assessment tool to ensure that the positive and negative implications of policy/proposal options are understood and included as part of the decision making process. The elements referred to in the representation can be included in the consideration of any policy/proposal but the inclusion of individual indicators for each is not supported.

**Employment** – No change.

S2 (page 82) and S3 cover percentage unemployment and percentage of population of working age that are economically active. These are considered sufficient.

**Skills** – No change.

S5 (page 83) already includes percentage of working age population with
Skills - Share of working-age population with qualifications by 2020 (aged 19 to state pension age)
- NVQ level 2 or equivalent qualification and above 90 per cent
- NVQ level 3 or equivalent qualification and above 68 per cent
- NVQ level 4 or equivalent qualification and above 40 per cent
- NVQ level 4 or above and percentage of 16 year olds with 5+ GCSEs (grades A-C). Further detailed are not considered necessary at this point but can be added in if monitoring reveals the need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Summary of main issue</th>
<th>Council’s Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21172 - Mr G Mitchell [8441]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>There should be a reflection of the local requests for smaller start up units which are more suited to smaller sites where demands on the infrastructure are reduced. One such site for small scale development that was proposed was site R0168a on Strayground lane. This land has been incorrectly assessed in your site assessment table, there being no water main through the site, and the landowner has offered to widen and improve Strayground lane, which is deliverable. There are no flooding issues. The site is bordered by the railway and other commercial sites and is a brownfield site, previously having been use for machinery engineering business and having a current planning permission for an Agricultural machinery business.</td>
<td>The Council do not intend to allocate site R0168a on Strayground Lane for smaller start up units as this site was rejected on accessibility grounds. The Council have revisited the site assessment process and will not be making changes to the table as the information being questioned was provided by outside bodies such as Anglian Water and Norfolk County Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21691 - January's Consultant Surveyors (Mr Brian Flynn) [9737] | Comment | The Council should seek to avoid this situation arising by allocating sites which are sustainable, have no significant constraints that cannot be mitigated or addressed through careful design and layout, and can be delivered at the time anticipated during the plan period. It is likely that applications will be submitted on sites which are not “preferred” if the Council continues with a strategy of selecting residential sites with significant and unresolvable constraints and which are undeliverable. If applications are submitted, the relevant policies of the adopted Joint Core Strategy unaffected by the recent High Court challenge and the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework should be taken into account. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF will be relevant to the determination of any application, particularly the need to maintain “...a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing...”. The assessment of sites contained in the Sustainability Appraisal document should enable the Council to determine whether the site is suitable for residential development in sustainability terms, and whether the proposed development adequately deals with any identified constraints. It would undermine the AAP process if non-preferred sites were granted planning permission, but this is an inevitable consequence of selecting sites which cannot be delivered. We request that the Council only Noted and agreed. All sites allocated in the WAAP will be deliverable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Acknowledgement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21422</td>
<td>Natural England (Ms J Nuttall) [9476]</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report The approach taken to assessing the sites against a range of criteria that address the SA objectives identified for the AAP is welcomed; in particular Natural England is pleased to note the inclusion of a range of relevant environmental criteria that has been used to assess the sites including effects on biodiversity, landscape and soils. We note that the SA identifies that none of the preferred options will have a direct adverse effect on statutory designated sites; however, please see our comments above regarding potential indirect impacts of housing development, through increased recreational disturbance, on Lower Wood, Ashwellthorpe SSSI. The SA should have identified this potential issue and put forward mitigation recommendations, including requirements to be identified in the AAP for provision of on-site multifunctional green infrastructure, as discussed above. We note that this assessment will be supplemented by an 'appropriate assessment', as required under the Conservation (Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010. Natural England advises that the results of this assessment (HRA) and any mitigation recommendations should inform preparation of this Plan. Natural England will be pleased to provide comments on revised versions of this Plan, following completion of the HRA.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The SA will be revised to take account of the potential indirect impacts of housing development on sites such as Lower Wood Ashwellthorpe SSSI. The Council will also be amending the Environment Chapter of the AAP to improve the approach to green infrastructure. This will also talk about improving GI and directing visitors away from sensitive areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20878</td>
<td>Mr G Mitchell [8441]</td>
<td>I wish to make comments on the following sites as some of the information is factually incorrect. You</td>
<td>Comments noted. Site A0029 has been included within the development boundary as the Council recognise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggested that I wrote to you and pointed these out.

**AO029 Land adjacent southern boundary of Bridge Industrial Estate**
This land is now part of Bridge Industrial Estate. The minerals have already been removed from this site prior to its development so 'mineral safeguarding provisions' will not apply. Access already exists and is by approved route through Bridge industrial estate, so NCC access comments would not apply. An independent foul sewerage system already exists and is in use.

**RO168a Land off Strayground lane**
The water main does not cross the site, but runs along the roadside so this would not be an issue. Surface water is not a problem as the ground is light gravelly soil and would be most suited to independent soakaways. I have already indicated that Strayground lane could easily be improved as we own the land running down the western edge, and this could be conditional to development.

**RO168b Land east of Strayground lane, south of Industrial Estate**
Water main does not cross the site but follows the boundary with the road. Foul sewerage and surface water are not a problem anymore than other sites south of Wymondham. In fact this free draining land would be most suited to independent system, so this is not a constraint. This land is incorrectly shown as being in a CWS, it is not. Four possible access routes were shown so Strayground Lane not the only route and in any event we have the ability to widen it as we own the land on the western side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AO029 Land adjacent southern boundary of Bridge Industrial Estate</th>
<th>RO168a Land off Strayground lane</th>
<th>RO168b Land east of Strayground lane, south of Industrial Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z1222 Land off Strayground Lane</strong></td>
<td>This land is shown as a flood risk, however it is intended to raise the ground up to road level using the excess material in neighbouring sites, this could be conditional upon the development. I feel it is necessary to bring these inaccuracies in the site appraisal to your attention as it appears that a very broad brush approach has been applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>21699 - Barton Willmore (Mr Andrew Wilford) [6151]</strong></th>
<th><strong>Object</strong> The current process which SNC is pursuing in relation to progressing separate DPDs to implement the JCS is not considered sound as it does not comply with provisions of SEA/SA Regulations. SNC has pre determined the distribution of the floating 1800 allocations between various settlements without testing alternative strategies through the SEA/SA process. No testing has taken place across the separate DPD's/AAP's. It is recommended that SNC should bring its DPD/AAP's into a single timetable following the outcome of the JCS review and the Inspector's Report. The JCS sets out a minimum of 2200 new allocations at Wymondham. Due to poor housing land supply in the NPA a number of schemes have been granted planning permission as departures e.g. windfalls. The WAAP is seeking to retrospectively allocate these windfall sites and as a result only 1488 new dwellings are proposed in the WAAP. The evidence base for the JCS confirms windfalls being in addition to allocations, however the WAAP's use of windfalls as allocations is to reduce the level of new housing below that required by the JCS with the result that the overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **21699 - Barton Willmore (Mr Andrew Wilford) [6151]** | **Object** The JCS tested a range of reasonable alternatives for the distribution of growth, and Alternative One was chosen. The spatial strategy of JCS Policy 9 details development in a number of strategic Norwich Policy Area locations. As an adopted plan (re-submission text notwithstanding), choosing a minimum 1800 dwellings at Long Stratton and 2200 at Wymondham is therefore in line with the JCS. JCS Policy 10 says that AAP's will be developed for both Wymondham and Long Stratton. The location for the 'floating 1800' was not predetermined without testing alternative strategies. Policy 9 of the JCS was followed: allocations to deliver the smaller sites in South Norfolk have been made in accordance with the settlement hierarchy and local environmental and servicing considerations. Each potential site proposed in the NPA to accomodate growth was assessed for its suitability, and allocations made on this basis, so a very significant number of alternatives have been considered. JCS Policy 4 says that: "Allocations will be made to ensure that at least 36,820 new homes can be
A housing target will never be met and the WAAP is not effective. It is not considered that SNC has adequately consulted on issues and options before setting out its current preferred option. This can be evidenced from the WAAP document which itself questions the deliverability of the preferred option confirming the necessary evidence base isn’t in place to demonstrate its deliverability.

Delivered...“. The emphasis is on the delivery of homes, not purely on making allocations to deliver homes. Given that the JCS was not adopted until 2011, the BW position on this issue is not logical, because it would not allow for any applications/approvals on emerging preferred sites to 'count', despite infrastructure and sustainability requirements being highly relevant in determining the most appropriate locations for development. There has been appropriate consultation on the WAAP. The sites at South Wymondham are deliverable, as is evidenced by the resolution to grant permission in June 2013 (subject to the completion of the S106 agreement by 4 October).

| 20892 - Mr David Underwood [8022] | Object | Do not agree re land suggested for employment use in Suton being dismissed on sustainability grounds as these sites were considered too far from services and facilities. Elm Farm (Z1258) has been successful at much greater distance from town centre. The main area of land allocated for employment use is at Browick Road which is well located to the town centre, rail station and A11 and scored well through the Sustainability Appraisal. Small extensions to existing industrial sites are proposed at Elm Farm and London Road. These were considered to be well related to existing business opportunities and only necessitated small extensions to the existing development boundary. Land at Suton was not considered suitable for employment growth because it is some way detached from the main built up area of Wymondham. It was considered that people would be more likely to use their cars to access employment opportunities in Suton, whereas those locations closer to the built up area of Wymondham offered possibilities for people to travel on foot, cycle or public transport. |
Comments received to the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document
Interim Sustainability Appraisal Consultation 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Main Issues</th>
<th>Council’s Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19788 - Hethersett Land Ltd</td>
<td>Hethersett Land Ltd have no specific comments on the general approach to the Sustainability Appraisal Report although the site assessment tables are difficult to interpret and make reference to sites which are not identified on the maps. For instance the Hethersett North site has been split up into different components, which are not shown on the Preferred Options (Sept 2012) map. Also, some results in the assessment tables seem not to appear correct in light of some available evidence and can be updated. Specifically, for sites north of Hethersett, the site assessment tables are out of date and can be updated to reflect current available evidence. See answer to question 12 for more comments. (See full, scanned rep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20465 - Steve</td>
<td>The sustainability appraisal interim report (SAI) appears comprehensive and most sections are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horrocks [9331]</td>
<td>Reasonably clear. I believe that combining the 'traffic light' approach with an easy-to-understand numerical approach would show clearly whether sites were being chosen for reasons primarily relating to objectively-ranked factors or that planning judgement reasons were considered of greater importance. Combining the traffic light notation and a numeric approach seems a clearer way of publishing and justifying the site assessment process. I would welcome South Norfolk implementing this approach to give reassurance to local stake-holders about the consistency and robustness of the process thus far. See full scanned rep attached (section 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20181 - Bidwells (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [1435]</td>
<td>Woodton No particular comments with regard to the appraisal and the site assessments. Specific comments relating to the Site Assessment process for Woodton and Bedingham (Map 090) and our client's site (0157) are detailed at Question 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18295 - Costessey Parish Council (Mrs Hilary Elias) [8570]</td>
<td>Councillors are concerned that whilst the SA includes environmental, social and economic objectives it often appears to be the case that development takes place without supporting infrastructure. Traffic and transport are major issues in Costessey. All development in Costessey impact on the roads and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The infrastructure needs of all proposed sites are considered appropriately, with the impact on Longwater junction a key element for Costessey sites. However, the full detail of traffic and transport impacts are most appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwater junction with the A47. Councillors questioned the level of detail re traffic/transport for each site</td>
<td>addressed through individual planning applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19811 - Mr Greengrass [8593]</td>
<td>Bawburgh is a settlement within the NPA which can accommodate further limited additional development to help deliver the smaller sites in the NPA allowance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18988 - Chedgrave Parish Council (Clive Boyd) [9453]</td>
<td>I would have preferred greater involvement of our Parish Council when SNC was first investigating potential sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19256 - Mr William Ling [8742]</td>
<td>Good but flawed in that the public will not understand the procedure and the building industry does. Also have failed too see are elected representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19839 - Bidwells (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [1435]</td>
<td>No particular comments with regard to the appraisal and the site assessments. However, it is particularly important to consider that the site assessment process for Costessey (map 27a) and site 0036 in particular, has been</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
superseded by appeal decision APP/L2630/A/2170575. This granted outline planning permission for 62 dwellings on site 0036.

We would suggest that the revised status for site 0036 with the site now benefitting from outline permission should be reflected within the Site Specific Allocations & Policies DPD and proposal map 027a by including the site within the preferred development boundary.

landscape harm. It is therefore not considered appropriate to include this site in the development boundary when to do so would mean that any later "infill" type proposals/densification would be much easier to achieve

<p>| 18148 - Mr &amp; Mrs AP &amp; SA Goldring [9205] | We would have to rely on your expertise. | Comment noted |
| 19900 - Mr Vaughan Smith [4283] | The Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out in accordance with the relevant guidance and legislation for preparing Development Plan documents. It is crucial that the appropriate Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken in accordance with relevant legislation otherwise the document could be found unsound by the Inspector at any subsequent Public Examination. The interim report that has been published for consultation is considered to be robust at this stage and has appropriately assessed the sites that are allocated in the Preferred Options for development sites allocations and development boundaries document. | Comments noted |
| 19002 - Dr John Mann [9454] | It is clearly sensible to consider sustainability at an early stage. However, where 'a good range of facilities' is mentioned, the quality of each should be carefully assessed. | To consider the quality of services would add an element of subjectivity to the process which would be unhelpful (i.e. controversial). Restricting consideration to just the quantity of services retains an objective position. |
| 19010 - Mr Hadingham [9455] | More publicity | As the Site Allocations process has been subject to three rounds of public consultation, with all parish councils contacted at each stage, alongside press notices and articles, with copies of documentation lodged in all South Norfolk libraries, it is considered that publicity has been adequate (and in line with that required by the Council's Statement of Community Involvement). |
| 18437 - Mr David Goldson [8643] | A complicated procedure - difficult to comprehend by the general public but satisfactory overall | Comment noted |
| 18940 - Mr John Downing [7932] | Whilst a lot of detail is given there are inconsistencies with this document and the scoring on the site assessment table for the Norwich Fringe where site 1173 has not been assessed for intrusion on the NSBLPZ. | The site assessment for 1173 (Trowse) does consider the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone, as can be seen in the 'traffic light' table. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18282 - Rockland St Mary with Hellington PC (Mr M Presland) [9254]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19938 - Bidwells (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [1435]</td>
<td>No particular comments with regard to the appraisal and the site assessments. Specific comments relating to the Site Assessment process for Ditchingham (Map 090) and our client's site (061) are detailed at Question 12.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19961 - Diocese of Norwich (The Diocese of Norwich) [7360]</td>
<td>It is considered that the overall approach has been appropriate. However, in relation to the residential allocations at Framingham Earl, it is suggested that the preferred options have not sufficiently allowed for smaller scale allocations that can come forward for development rapidly. The preferred allocations consequently rely on a lower quantity of landowners/developers, rather than spreading risk and opportunity. It is argued that the benefit of providing smaller scale allocations should not be disregarded as they enable development to be more evenly spread and can assist in providing a variety of development opportunities and outcomes. An edge of village proposal, slightly more</td>
<td>The Site Allocations Plan runs to 2026. All allocated sites have had their viability confirmed, and the three allocated sites in Poringland/Framingham Earl are the most appropriate to allocate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distant from the village centre is evidently desirable to potential occupiers, yet still sufficiently proximate to services to be deemed sustainable and worthy of allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>19848 - BDP (Mr Andrew Watson) [9613]</th>
<th>NRP is broadly in agreement with the general approach taken in preparing the DPD, including the sustainability appraisal report, overall objectives and site assessment process.</th>
<th>Comment noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>18182 - Bramerton PC (Mr Brian Ansell) [8264]</td>
<td>Appears so.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>18747 - Redenhall with Harleston Town Council (Mrs Margot Harbour) [8597]</td>
<td>We consider that the approach taken has been largely appropriate. However, we do consider that further attention is required to meet the future demands on traffic flows and car parking.</td>
<td>The impact of development proposals on traffic flows is a key consideration in their acceptability (or otherwise). Appropriate levels of car-parking are best assessed at the planning application stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>19095 - Cllr Leslie Dale [8581]</td>
<td>It is incomplete. The first line of the first paragraph requires the &quot;identifying of environmental impacts&quot;. In the context of the growth areas being asked to swallow the developments, the individual site assessments and preamble make no mention of the obvious impacts upon the existing community. Reassess in retrospect.</td>
<td>The impact on existing communities is considered, for example, with reference to traffic impacts and impacts on the character and form of settlements. However, the overall level of growth for each settlement has already been set in the adopted Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19733 - Chedgrave Parish Council (Miss J M Bircham BSc MRICS) [9597]</td>
<td>It is not currently a statutory requirement and is premature to carry out at this stage. It should only be done as and when it is required.</td>
<td>Sustainability appraisal is a statutory requirement and has been prepared hand-in-hand with options development for the document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19484 - Mrs S De-Courtney [9517]</td>
<td>Not everyone has access to a computer to look up information. More consultation with local residents.</td>
<td>Information has been posted to those requesting it. In addition, all parish councils received hard copies of documentation, as has South Norfolk libraries. SNC officers have also undertaken a number of public 'roadshows' during the document production process. With three separate consultation rounds, and thousands of responses received, it is not accepted that more consultation is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20048 - Bidwells (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [1435]</td>
<td>Generally support the appraisal and site assessment approach. However specific comments relating to the assessment of Site 1005 are detailed at question 12.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18625 - Hethersett Parish Council</td>
<td>The PC considers that the approach taken has been appropriate</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18721</td>
<td>Mr Roger Smith</td>
<td>Density of housing development is a major issue, which is to be &quot;subject to form, character and servicing restraints&quot;. The implication of this is not evident from the approach being taken in determining the number of units proposed.</td>
<td>Form, character and servicing restraints will influence acceptable densities, but it is unlikely that an extremely low density scheme (below 20 dwellings per hectare) would be appropriate. No change is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19566</td>
<td>Mrs Alison Morsom</td>
<td>The approach is too localised. The bigger picture should be looked at</td>
<td>The adopted Joint Core Strategy sets the bigger picture for future development in South Norfolk. In a rural district, with many small settlements, a localised approach is also necessary, however</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19795</td>
<td>Parker Planning Services Ltd (Mr Jason Parker)</td>
<td>Mainly yes - however certain criteria such as brownfield and infill not given weight.</td>
<td>Both brownfield and infill statuses are given weight in the site assessment process - both form part of the 'traffic light' table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19555</td>
<td>Dr M Fewster</td>
<td>No I consider that too much has been done by looking at maps and statistics and too little by visiting and talking to the inhabitants of settlements over a period.</td>
<td>The site assessment exercise relies on a mix of published information, officers' local knowledge and the consultation responses from local residents. Inevitably there will sometimes be disagreement between what the Council believes are acceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has to be carried out in accordance with the relevant guidance and legislation for preparing Development Plan documents. This is required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

The Council has to ensure that its proposed Development Plan Documents have been appropriately assessed in terms of its environmental impact as a result of the requirements set out in the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive.

The interim report that has been published for consultation acknowledges that SA is an iterative process and will be updated as the Site Specific Allocations DPD is progressed. It is important that this process is robust and can withstand challenge and investigation from third parties. At the present time we can see no reason why this should not be the case.

<p>| 20435 - Savills (Mr Mark Hodgson) [9618] | The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has to be carried out in accordance with the relevant guidance and legislation for preparing Development Plan documents. This is required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Council has to ensure that its proposed Development Plan Documents have been appropriately assessed in terms of its environmental impact as a result of the requirements set out in the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive. The interim report that has been published for consultation acknowledges that SA is an iterative process and will be updated as the Site Specific Allocations DPD is progressed. It is important that this process is robust and can withstand challenge and investigation from third parties. At the present time we can see no reason why this should not be the case. | Comment noted |
| 18458 - Mr Roger Margand [9312] | The report has been written in a very technical way and is difficult to understand without specific focused knowledge. The abbreviations in it are often not explained or defined at the | Sustainability Appraisal is formal legal process to be followed, so an element of technical language is unavoidable. However, the next |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19969 - Hibbert &amp; Key [7363]</td>
<td>Hibbett and Key have no specific comments on the 'general' approach to the Sustainable Appraisal Report. However, some results in the assessment tables seem do not appear correct in light of available evidence and can be updated. Specifically, for sites in Framingham Earl, the site assessment tables are out of date and can be updated to reflect current available evidence. See answer to Q.12 for more detailed comments. The information provided will be assessed and any appropriate modifications will be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19509 - Mr Stephen Joyce [9519]</td>
<td>I think it is a good idea to get the residents view and take into account all the negative and positive effect the new buildings will bring to Brooke. Comment noted. All positive and negative impacts are taken into account when considering potential sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19019 - Ms Susan Stacey [9457]</td>
<td>The approach seems appropriate. However this was a lengthy document which was quite difficult to follow. SA is a legal and technical process, and with many hundreds of potential sites to assess, a lengthy document is unavoidable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18415 -</td>
<td>Yes Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19168 - A N Williams [3092]</td>
<td>It is impracticable to reach a considered opinion on each policy of the SAR by every member of the Parish Council in a meeting due to weight of information. The policies are created by SNDC and applied as they see appropriate where each community has not created its own Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore the Parish Council is not in a position to offer an alternative at this point. Scole Parish does however have a Community Survey completed in 2009 and updated annually which has not been considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18787 - Scole Parish Council (Mrs Corinna Moore) [9415]</td>
<td>It is impracticable to reach a considered opinion on each policy of the SAR by every member of the Parish Council in a meeting due to weight of information. The policies are created by SNDC and applied as they see appropriate where each community has not created its own Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore the Parish Council is not in a position to offer an alternative at this point. Scole Parish does however have a Community Survey completed in 2009 and updated annually which has not been considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20218 - Parker Planning Services Ltd</td>
<td>Site 0161 - Wortwell Brownfield/previously developed land has not been given priority in this case or infill sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mr Jason Parker) [9610]</td>
<td>However, the brownfield/greenfield status is only on criterion amongst many, and its presence does not necessarily mean that a brownfield site should be allocated if, say, the highways impact would be unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18314 - Tasburgh PC (Catherine. Moore) [8548]</td>
<td>No comment or response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20036 - Persimmon Homes Ltd Anglia Region [280]</td>
<td>No specific comments to make on Sustainability Appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19590 - Mrs Karin Rundle [9528]</td>
<td>Alpington/Yelverton: No, the infrastructure, roads, sewers and overall viability has not been considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18938 - Mr Steven Fisher [9451]</td>
<td>Don't agree. All options within existing boundary should have been fully explored and solutions sought, before opting for 'easy fix' of simply extending development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20170 - Mr &amp; Mrs R L Wharton [8270]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20187 - Mrs Michelle Richman [9540]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19122 - Mr &amp; Mrs Jeremy Brown [9465] 19757 - Savills (Mr Will Lusty) [8119] 19914 -</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidwells (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [1435] 20163 - Mr Steven Fisher [9451]</td>
<td>There are inconsistencies with the document and I did not find it terribly clear &amp; had to really study it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19264 - Lady Veronica Fitzroy [9479]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20086 - Mr &amp; Mrs Ian &amp; Julie Ward [7905]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20097 - Mr &amp; Mrs Sheehan [9535]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20140 - Mr Nigel Watson [9537]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20116 - Mrs Mollie Arnold [9536]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19591 - Mr Phil Gledhill [7798]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20063 - Mrs Liz Alden [9530]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18921 - Mr George Bircham [6888]</td>
<td>More consideration should be given to the needs and housing of local people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20198 - Mr David Richman [9193]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19925 - Robert Doughty Consultancy Limited (Mr Robert)</td>
<td>Objection to the Sustainability Appraisal with regard to the assessment approach adopted as no attempt has been made to review individual sites with landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is inevitably some subjectivity in assessing the acceptability of potential sites, and in some settlements there may be more &quot;acceptable&quot; sites than need to be allocated to meet allocation figures. The Council is satisfied that the allocated sites are those which are most appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overall housing allocation for each settlement has largely been set in the adopted Joint Core Strategy. Local need for affordable housing is assessed regularly, however</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All sites suggested for development were assessed against a detailed checklist. This gave the Council a high level of detail about the suitability of each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughty) [9373]</td>
<td>site for allocation, this coupled with the fact that information submitted about each site is kept on file, meant that it was not considered necessary to review each individual site with the landowner. The Council were aware that the owner wished to promote site A0018 for mixed use or housing as this is referred to in the conclusions column of the site assessment table. It was considered that there were more preferable sites for housing located elsewhere in Loddon with better accessibility to services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19133 - Robert Knights [5750]</td>
<td>The process requires amending by looking at the environmental impact on flooding in this 'preferred site'. This land is not the 'right place' for growth within the village as the road in from Wymondham is already inadequate for a gateway into the village due to heavy traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20075 - Mrs Cruickshank [9533]</td>
<td>The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more "acceptable" sites than need to be allocated to meet allocation figures. The Council is satisfied that the allocated sites are those which are most appropriate.

| 20151 - Mr & Mrs Trevor & Linda Forder [9539] | The conclusions column does not fairly reflect a number of possible site options. In our opinion there are sites shown as red and amber which are suitable. | There is inevitably some subjectivity in assessing the acceptability of potential sites, and in some settlements there may be more "acceptable" sites than need to be allocated to meet allocation figures. The Council is satisfied that the allocated sites are those which are most appropriate. |
| 19134 - Stoke Holy Cross PC (Mrs L Marsh) [9464] | The site assessment comment for sites in Stoke Holy Cross are disappointingly inadequate, and in the parish Council's opinion have resulted in an incorrect analysis of the capacity of the village to accept additional development and a flawed specific site assessment, that has been used to identify preferred sites. 75 dwellings are being proposed for lower Stoke, which will undoubtedly put significant pressure on existing services and facilities in the village such as the school, drainage, and roads, and there is inaccurate assessment of their current availability and adequacy. The | Stoke Holy Cross is identified for 10-20 dwellings, but has been concluded to be acceptable to accommodate some of the 'floating' 1800 dwellings in the NPA. The chosen sites for 75 dwellings are concluded to be appropriate for allocation. |
Parish Council is therefore very concerned that it has been assumed that this scale of growth will be acceptable when it clearly will create future planning problems that have not yet been taken into account.

<p>| 19515 - Mr and Mrs Betts [9520] | Whilst agreeing the need for strong, healthy communities we feel that the chosen site in Bracon Ash is too large a development for the needs and infrastructure of the village it will not enhance the environment and is not in the heart of the village. The access from the B1113 is highly dangerous and there is no footpath, which even if created would still be a major problem for pedestrians as this road is one with a high traffic volume. | Whilst some highways improvements may be necessary to the B1113/A140 junction, site 0819 is concluded to be the most appropriate to allocate in Bracon Ash |
| 20212 - Durrants (Richard Prentice) [1407] | Woodton Yes | Comment noted |
| 20422 - J M Greetham [4475] | The Council's consultation includes the preferred options for the development and use of land having regard to the Joint Core Strategy and a Sustainability Appraisal Report (SA). The SA Report and the work undertaken as part of that process has been prepared in accordance with the Government Guidance and we are satisfied that it is reasonably robust in the approach to the site assessment process. | Comment noted |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Commentaire</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18477 - Dr G. Martin Courtier [7815] 19011 - Wheatacre &amp; Burgh St Peter Parish Council (Mr Simon Solomon) [6584]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18155 - Mr M C Litton [9207]</td>
<td>Yes appropriate</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20251 - Easton Landowners Consortium [7254]</td>
<td>Refer to full submission The Sustainability Appraisal Report and the work undertaken as part of that process has been prepared in accordance with the Government Guidance. The Council fully appreciate that the process is an iterative one and acknowledges that the performance of the Plan has to be tested against identified social, environmental and economic objectives. It is our view that the sustainability appraisal follows Government Guidance and is robust and consequently it has appropriately assessed sites within the site assessment process.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18330 - Thurton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC (R Taylor) [1180]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19154 - Cllr Margaret Dewsbury [9466]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19070 - MRS SHIRLEY DENNISON [5034]</td>
<td>The approach seems reasonable.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19235 - Natural England (Ms J Nuttall) [9476]</td>
<td>The approach taken to assessing the sites against a range of criteria that address the SA objectives identified for the DPD is welcomed; in particular Natural England is pleased to note the inclusion of a range of relevant environmental criteria that has been used to assess the sites including effects on biodiversity, landscape and soils. We note that the SA identifies that none of the preferred allocations will have a direct adverse effect on designated sites and that any other potential effects will be confirmed as part of the 'Appropriate Assessment' required under the Conservation (Habitats and Species) Regulations 2010. Natural England advises that the results of this assessment (HRA) and any mitigation recommendations should inform</td>
<td>A Habitats Regulations Assessment is being prepared in consultation with Natural England, and Natural England’s assistance in the process is much appreciated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Number</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19873 - Durrants (Richard Prentice) [1407]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19467 - Dudley Jones [6175]</td>
<td>I feel that the approach taken has been entirely appropriate &amp; reasonable.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19881 - Burt Boulton Holdings Limited [7336]</td>
<td>The approach taken to the Sustainability Report is supported in general terms.</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18395 - Marlingford &amp; Colton PC (Mr M Bergin) [7437]</td>
<td>Yes, although resolving potential conflicts between SA objectives and site specific policy objectives may not always be possible.</td>
<td>It is inevitable that there will sometimes be negative impacts when allocating certain sites. In a largely rural district, for instance, there are relatively few brownfield sites and so many greenfield sites need to be allocated. However, the sites chosen are those assessed to have the most positive and least negative impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 19931 - Phillip Jeans Homes | Support results of the Sustainability Appraisal in principle however would suggest that site | Comments noted. The Joint Core Strategy allocates between 100-
| Ltd (Phillip Jeans Homes Ltd) [7358] | 530 has capacity for 300 rather than 200 dwellings to maximise the social and economic benefits of the proposal | 200 new dwellings for Loddon/Chedgrave. The Council have allocated to the upper limit of this requirement and do not propose to increase the size of the allocation at site 530 |
| 19110 - Mr & Mrs J Smith [7931] | Yes | Comment noted |
| 19949 - Durrants (Richard Prentice) [1407] | Yes | Comment noted |
| 19503 - Dr Gibson [7575] | Yes | Comment noted |
| 18967 - Mr A Hall [2112] | Very appropriate | Comment noted |
| 19799 - Durrants (Richard Prentice) [1407] | Yes | Comment noted |
| 18959 - Mr L Gardner [9278] | Yes the approach has been appropriate with the details outlined | Comment noted |
| 19780 - Armstrong Rigg Planning (Ms Charlotte Wyn) | It is considered that the approach taken is appropriate and that the scale of development within settlements is proportionate to the needs of the housing markets and reflects the | Comment noted |
provision of local services and needs within each settlement to support such additions to the population. The assessment criteria ensures only the most suitable sites with the ability to deliver housing within the plan period have been incorporated.

(Refer to scanned rep)

| 18984 - Mr Robert Hadingham | Yes, likely significant effects of a development should be tested. Sustainable development being the key test, especially in relationships to existing services in the village | Having adequate services is a key consideration in the acceptability (or otherwise) of all potential sites |
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Summary of Main Issue</th>
<th>Council's Assessment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8534 - Mrs Elizabeth McWilliam [71179]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Many of the sites are areas of outstanding natural beauty (or have an abundance of wildlife in the trees, streams and hedgerows already endangered, without additional aggravation) and have access by publicly marked footpaths which would be lost to Hingham and surrounding residents who regularly use them rambling, on walks and exercising dogs</td>
<td>The current site checklist lists a number of statutory and local environmental designations and public rights of way. A detailed site assessment of individual sites at preferred options will flag up any particular issues on individual sites</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6512 - Mr Ian Grady [6567]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All services are layed to site All road in layed to site Flexibility to the village needs</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council will be undertaking a detailed assessment of individual sites at the preferred options stage</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9568 - Geological Society of Norfolk(GSN) (Ms Jenny Gladstone) [3379] | Comment | Is also missing Local Geodiversity Sites. 
(I am unsure whether only previous designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan are included here. If RIGS were not named within that plan, then that is an old deficiency.) | Site checklist was amended to include ‘Geodiversity Action Plan Area’. However, the Norfolk Geodiversity Action Plan does not identify sites which should be protected. This element is therefore not reflected on the site assessment tables, but comments in the Geological Society of Norfolk representions have been taken on board. | Checklist amended |
| 10162 - Hopkins Homes (Robert Eburne) [7138] | Comment | Checklist should be raised to reflect the fact that some urban extensions will provide services, facilities and infrastructure as part of development but which do not currently exist. | The checklist includes a note of the services and facilities within the settlement. Only very large sites would support the provision of additional core services as part of a development proposal. Since this would not apply to most sites, the checklist was not amended. However, any significant development in a settlement would be expected to provide facilities and services to support and enhance the existing local provision. This benefit is recognised as one of the reasons for concentrating development, and at appropriate locations this approach will be taken in allocating sites. | None |
| 6379 - Mrs J Teny [6517] | Comment | Numbering system on map and list is not very easy to understand | Comment noted. The Council presented a large number of suggested sites for consultation in the clearest and most understandable way that it could | None |
COUNCILMEETINGS\ns\n\ntable\n\n| Comment | Action |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Tim East has raised concerns regarding the inclusion and labelling of SHLAA sites in the consultation, suggesting that consulting on those sites where the landowner has not promoted them is confusing to the members of the public and restricting potential comments on those sites. Councillor East suggested further confusion is cause by consulting on sites which are in landscape designation areas and are therefore extremely unlikely to come forward for development.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England would like to see the following designations included Local Nature Reserves, Roadside Nature Reserves etc. Greater clarification of 'green infrastructure corridor'. Designation of 'Biodiversity Action Plan Areas' should be explicit that this refers to both BAP habitats and species</td>
<td>Site checklist to be amended to incorporate designations and changes suggested by Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments noted. More detailed comments at subsequent stages in the process would be welcomed.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment, understand need for housing but areas with good rail/water/road connections close to Norwich should be considered for high density housing before more challenging rural areas are considered</td>
<td>Agreed. In preparing the Site Specific DPD the Council will follow the settlement hierarchy in the JCS which directs the larger developments to the areas closest to Norwich and then follows a hierarchy of development down to smaller rural communities which are planned to have no new development. The settlement hierarchy is based upon access to services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How do I comment on the sites that have been suggested?

**Q4** Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6685 - Timewell Properties Ltd**  
(Timewell Properties Ltd) [7306] | Comment: Unclear how the ‘small sites in the NPA’ allowance (1800) homes will be distributed. Timewell Properties suggest that Little Melton is capable of accommodating a proportion of these homes. The criteria for allocating these sites should also be subject to consultation.  
The Sustainability Appraisal Framework focuses too much on negative impacts of development, should also recognise the positive impacts. Should positively and specifically identify those development sites that contribute to the objective of securing sustainable development.  
An important role of the SA process will be to appraise the options for distribution of the 1800 in the NPA to ensure that the best performing sustainable distribution of numbers to the most appropriate settlements is achieved. | The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist to ensure a sustainable assessment of sites and distribution of development. The distribution of the ‘small sites in the NPA’ allowance of 1800 homes will be undertaken at the preferred options stage, once a full assessment has been made of all the sites put forward for development. |
| **6868 - Dr Barbara Thomas** [6613] | Comment: The 2010 site specific Map 19 shows most suggested sites to be at odds with the site checklist categories notably accessibility, services and facilities, viability, land use designation, environment and existing SNLP land use categories which are ENV3. Yet again, the suggested sites represent the financial greed of landowners and developers rather than the needs of the town of Diss and its non-landowning residents. | The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development. |
| **7064 - Mr J Cogman** [1767] | Comment: Must be close to public transport routes e.g. bus routes | Site checklist includes accessibility to public transport as one of the criteria |
| **9412 - Mr John Thain** [6775]  
9422 - Dr Viven Thain [6877] | Comment: Need to consider the potential health effects of electricity power lines on occupants of nearby houses | Comments noted. Considered too detailed for the broad site checklist, however a detailed issue such as this will be considered on an individual site basis as assessments are undertaken. |
| **8505 - Mr & Mrs R Naish** [7175] | Comment: Find it difficult to find information on the Council website | Comments noted |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>nt</th>
<th>ns</th>
<th>tati</th>
<th>nI</th>
<th>ti</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>ndix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
How do I comment on the sites that have been suggested?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Proximity to local services should also reflect cycling time to them.</th>
<th>Better expressed as 800 metres with walking/cycling time in brackets as individuals' walking/cycling times may vary.</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Hingham - think of road usage - main roads in and out of Hingham</td>
<td>The Site Checklist does include reference to the need for highways improvements. A detailed assessment will be made of individual sites and comments will be sought from Norfolk County Council as the Highways Authority. This will flag up accessibility and highways issues.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>It is not clear to what level this checklist will be used by the council in assessing constraints on sites. If this is the case, there is a need to identify all biodiversity constraints. This should not just include designated sites such as SSSIs and County Wildlife Sites but also include Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats and protected species. It may be necessary for the council to gather additional evidence on BAP habitats as this information is not necessarily held by other bodies.</td>
<td>Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) areas are included on the site checklist under the 'Designations' section. This refers to both habitats and species. BAPs and GI corridors do not feature on the traffic light assessment tables but were assessed as appropriate.</td>
<td>BAP included on checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>We consider that there should be explicit reference to land to be provided for the future development of accommodation to meet the care needs of older people. The need for housing and care is referred to within the Joint Core Strategy and we consider that this need should be included within the search for development sites within South Norfolk.</td>
<td>Officers to note if land has been put forward specifically for accommodation to meet the care needs of older people in the ‘suggested land use’ box on the site checklist. JCS policies directing the distribution of housing with care will shape policy requirements at appropriate settlements.</td>
<td>Application of checklist altered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7109 - Zurich Assurance Limited [6689]</td>
<td>The site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information on the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10124 - Harcombe Development Ltd [7410]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10180 - Hethersett Land Ltd [7362]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5917 - Mrs Shirley Thatcher [6386]</td>
<td>The site assessment checklist was included as part of the consultation material</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7467 - Ms Mary Fairburn [6854]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8481 - Mr Nigel Edwards [6975]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6602 - Mr P McCarter [6579]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6542 - Dickleburgh and Rushall [5575]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council (Mrs Claire Sparkes) [6575]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6635 - Mr Peter Porter [6559]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6539 - Mr Stewart Read [6574]</td>
<td>The number of houses allocated to each settlement is set out in the Joint Core Strategy, which specifies 10-20 houses in each service village. This can not be changed through the site specific DPD process.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6692 - P Murton [2547]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6415 - Mrs May Lukey [6533]</td>
<td>In some instances no suggested land use has put forward by the person suggesting the site for development and also the Council do not necessarily know what the existing land use is at this stage unless we have been told by the person putting forward the land. This information will be clarified when the sites are subject to a full assessment later in the process</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9881 - Ms F Whalley [3073] (061)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current checklist provides guidance on the information to be gathered on each site but provides little guidance as to how the assessment will be undertaken. It is unclear how a site will be considered suitable for allocation when judged against alternative site options. The Council should publish the criteria that will be used to assess the different site options and policies. The checklist contains a number of environmental designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan which will effectively be superseded by the LDF process. There will need to be an understanding of how sites will be assessed against these criteria and the weight that will be given to them. Designations such as river valleys do not preclude development and limited weight should be given to them.</td>
<td>The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development. Local designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan will be reviewed. They are included on the checklist so that a full assessment of sites can be undertaken but it doesn't necessarily follow that these designations would preclude development. Some information on the checklist will be weighted/scored higher than other information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9561 - Sunguard (Sunguard C/O Agent) [7407]</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current checklist provides guidance on information to be gathered but provides little guidance as to how the assessment will be undertaken. It is unclear how it will be determined whether a site is considered suitable for allocation when judged against alternative site options. The Council should publish the criteria that will be used to assess the different site options and policies. The checklist contains a number of environmental designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan, which will be superseded by the LDF process. There needs to be an understanding on the weight which will be given to them as these designations do not necessarily preclude development. It is noted that highways information will be based on consultation with Norfolk County Council. This approach is welcomed. Finally a general point is that development of a site may actually provide some of the services and facilities defined within the checklist</td>
<td>The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development. Local designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan will be reviewed. They are included on the checklist so that a full assessment of sites can be undertaken but it doesn't necessarily follow that these designations would preclude development. Some information on the checklist will be weighted/scored higher than other information. Support for consultation with Norfolk County Council regarding highways issues is noted. It is also noted that the development of a site may actually provide some of the services and facilities defined within the checklist and this will need to be considered when the individual sites are assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do I comment on the sites that have been suggested?

Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>nt tions tur</th>
<th>in Is</th>
<th>nci As nt</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10095 - Harcombe Development Ltd (Harcombe Developments Ltd) [7410] (1005)</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The current checklist provides guidance on the information to be gathered on each site but provides little guidance as to how the assessment will be undertaken. It is unclear how sites will be scored/weighted and how the information obtained through the checklist will be used to determine whether a site is considered suitable for allocation. The checklist contains a list of designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan which will effectively be superceded by the LDF process. There needs to be an understanding of how sites will be assessed against these criteria and the weight that will be given to them. These designations do not necessarily preclude development.</td>
<td>The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development. Local designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan will be reviewed. They are included on the checklist so that a full assessment of sites can be undertaken but it doesn't necessarily follow that these designations would preclude development. Some information on the checklist will be weighted/scored higher than other information</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10348</td>
<td>Whilst we support the intention to allocate sufficient land in Poringland/Framingham Earl for up to 200 homes, it is unclear from the current consultation how the additional ‘small sites in the NPA’ allowance (1,800 homes) will be distributed amongst the South Norfolk settlements in the NPA, including Poringland/Framingham Earl. This should be made clearer, particularly as the Joint Core Strategy currently provides no clear guidance about how the homes will be distributed within the NPA. The criteria for allocating the ‘small sites in the NPA’ allowance should also be subject to consultation. Poringland/Framingham Earl is a suitable location to accommodate further growth beyond that specified in the Joint Core Strategy. It is not totally clear how the proposed site specific policies/designations, i.e. Cittaslow in Diss, Poringland Urban Drainage Structure etc and other site specific policies will be assessed. The Checklist should include an assessment of how sites could contribute towards delivering other settlement specific aims/policies. For instance, in Poringland/Framingham Earl’s case the Poringland Urban Drainage Strategy. We suggest that the Framingham Earl site is key to achieving this policy as it includes an important element of the village’s drainage system, which has the potential to be improved through the site’s development for the benefit of the wider village. (See attached supporting documents).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8572</td>
<td>I understand that additional sites are to be added to the list - fuller information required</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6214</td>
<td>Grown areas, places to walk, leave some countryside</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5931</td>
<td>I find the checklist and form totally confusing</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stat: 4
Nt: 4
Ns: 2
Tati: 1
I: 1
Tl: 0
App: 0
Mldx: 0
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Name/Details</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6209 - Mr Christopher Doggett [6410]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>If development is required it should be reasonable, proportional in size and sensitive in nature. It should be an extension to existing residential areas where roads can cope and disruption is minimal. Comments noted. These criteria are similar to the ones the Council will be looking at when making a detailed assessment of sites and deciding where new allocations should be made. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8371 - N B Woods Drawing Services (Mr Nick Woods) [1381]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>National Policy Guidelines have been changed from density quota per hectare. Comments noted. The checklist has a box for recording the suggested density of the development. The Council have assumed a density of 30 per hectare as a rough guide when assessing sites but actual densities may vary depending on local circumstances, such as the nature of surrounding development or the particular characteristics of the site. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10079 - Harcombe Development Ltd (Harcombe Developments Ltd) [7410]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The current checklist provides guidance on the information to be gathered on each site but provides little guidance as to how the assessment will be undertaken. It is unclear how information obtained through the checklist will be weighted/scored and how it will be determined that a site is considered suitable for allocation. The checklist includes a number of designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan which will effectively be superceded by the LDF process. There needs to be an understanding of how sites will be assessed against these criteria and the weight that will be given to them. Such designations do not preclude development and limited weight should be given to them. Development of a site may actually provide some of the services and facilities defined within the checklist. The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development. Local designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan will be reviewed. They are included on the current site checklist so that a full assessment of sites can be undertaken but it does not necessarily follow that these designations would preclude development. Some information on the checklist will be weighted/scored higher than other information. The site assessment process will need to recognise that some of the larger sites being proposed would actually be able to provide some of the services and facilities defined within the checklist. A detailed assessment of individual sites will be undertaken at the preferred options stage and the ability for sites to provide additional services and facilities will be reflected at this stage. None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>6344 - Mrs Penelope Wilson-Downe [6481]</td>
<td>Are the owners of the sites prepared for change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>9544 - Persimmon Homes Ltd Anglia Region (Persimmon Homes Ltd Anglia Region) [7356]</td>
<td>Overall this seems to cover most of the issues that need to be considered in assessing suitability and deliverability and so informing choices about which sites to allocate for development. Ownership and viability are often key factors. In this respect it may be helpful to note whether a developer/housebuilder is involved in promoting the site as this can positively influence timing and funding issues. In relation to brownfield sites it would also be helpful to note whether there are any known &quot;abnormal&quot; costs due to ground conditions/contamination that could affect viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>11622 - English Heritage (Katherine Fletcher) [930]</td>
<td>Pleased to see that designated heritage assets are included within the checklist. Issues of wider character and the setting of heritage assets will need to be incorporated into the final assessment. This may be a further level of appraisal based on additional information held by the Council. We recommend that the Historic Characterisation and Sensitivity Assessment is complemented by more detailed appraisal work, including conservation appraisals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>8458 - N Thompson [2974]</td>
<td>If you are trying to encourage people to use public transport then it should be less than 800m (say 500m or less) to a bus route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

The checklist provides guidance on information to be gathered on each site but provides little guidance as to how the assessment will be undertaken. It is unclear how the information obtained through the checklist will be used to determine whether a site is considered suitable for allocation. How will sites/policies be scored or weighted? The Council should publish the criteria that will be used to assess the different site options and site policies.

Site checklist contains a number of designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan which may be superceded by the LDF process. There needs to be an understanding of how sites will be assessed against these criteria and the weight that will be given to them as these designations do not necessarily preclude development.

Local designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan will be reviewed. They are included on the current site checklist so that a full assessment of sites can be undertaken but it doesn’t necessarily follow that these designations would preclude development. Some information on the checklist will be weighted/scored higher than other information.

Information on highway improvement will be provided by Norfolk County Council. This information will only be sought for those sites that are considered suitable for development after some weighting/scoring has taken place. Norfolk County Council to be asked to provide information regarding the level of impact on trunk road and whether the site would be the first point of access onto a trunk road.

**Comment**

9897 - Bidwells (Mr Graham Bloomfield) [1435] (092)

The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/_score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development.

Local designations from the South Norfolk Local Plan will be reviewed. They are included on the current site checklist so that a full assessment of sites can be undertaken but it doesn’t necessarily follow that these designations would preclude development. Some information on the checklist will be weighted/scored higher than other information.

10206 - Highways Agency (Mr Eric Cooper) [3700]

Yes. It is suggested that the section on Highways and Accessibility is expanded/changed to provide a broader level of understanding of the impact of proposed sites onto the trunk road. As the number of trunk road junctions are relatively few in number, it should be easy to identify where most of the traffic from any site would access the trunk road and this would consequently provide at a glance the potential for cumulative impacts of various sites within a vicinity.

In combination of all the relative factors it should be possible to give an indication of overall sustainability.

Suggested Changes:

- Impact on Trunk Road: Low/Medium/High
- Likely first point of access onto trunk road: ...
- Is the site considered sustainable?: Low/Medium/High

Information on highway improvement will be provided by Norfolk County Council. This information will only be sought for those sites that are considered suitable for development after some weighting/scoring has taken place. Norfolk County Council to be asked to provide information regarding the level of impact on trunk road and whether the site would be the first point of access onto a trunk road.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map not clear, needs to be more detailed so man in street can understand. What is meant by settlements in Q1 and Q2.</td>
<td>The Council had a large number of different sites to show on maps as part of the consultation and it is considered that the information was presented in the clearest way possible. The Council did not want to present too much detailed information on the maps as then they become more difficult to understand. More detail about each site was presented on an accompanying background table. The word 'settlement' in questions 1 and 2 refers to a particular village/town or place where people live. The JCS is settlement based and this approach has been continued through into the Site Specifics DPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add the details of the natural watercourse and ponds.</td>
<td>Officers to note if land contains any natural watercourses or ponds under 'current land use' box on site checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The checklist shows no indication of the size of suggested development (i.e. no. of houses).</td>
<td>Checklist does include a box for 'potential number of units'. This was originally assessed using a guide of 30 dwellings per hectare, but after individually assessing sites, the number of potential dwellings on preferred sites reflects site constraints and surrounding context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites adjacent to scheduled monuments should be refused unless they can clearly demonstrate that development would not adversely affect the setting of adjacent monuments. Allocations containing or adjacent to listed buildings would also have to demonstrate that development would not have an adverse impact. Following site allocation the Historic Environment Record (HER) should be consulted prior to application for planning permission and appropriate assessments and statements should be submitted.</td>
<td>Comments noted and will be taken into consideration through the assessment and allocation of sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>ntns</th>
<th>tnr</th>
<th>intIs</th>
<th>nci</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>nt</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10344 - Mr A. Semmence [2828]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The current checklist provides guidance on the information to be gathered on each site but provides little guidance as to how to assessment will be undertaken. It is unclear how the information obtained through the checklist will be used to determine whether a site is considered suitable for allocation when judged against alternative site options; or how site specific policies/designations will be assessed against alternative proposals. For instance, whether assessed sites/policies would be given a score against the items on the checklist, or whether assessment items will be weighted according to importance/relevance. The Council should publish the criteria that will be used to assess the different site options and site specific policies/designations.</td>
<td>The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9263 - Karen Dunn [5621]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>The list could include a higher priority to developing brownfield sites and a lower priority given to conservation/green sites/even scrubland as vegetation increases the value and quality of a place. Also lower priority should be given to agricultural land, which will become increasingly important as the population grows and food imports become more expensive.</td>
<td>The current site checklist is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on the information in the checklist e.g. is a brownfield site of higher priority than a greenfield site, should development be on high quality agricultural land? Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered inappropriate for development.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10066 - Peter &amp; Dawn Durrant [1906]</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Do not believe CPO's are appropriate on moral grounds.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council would only pursue CPO in very exceptional circumstances.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stat ntns tati nI ti n App ndix
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8247 - Endurance Estates Limited (Mr Tim Holmes) [6236]</td>
<td>The site checklist does not include any reference to sensitivities noted in the JCS in relation to Wymondham. The JCS highlights a number of other sensitivities in terms of the settlement identity, the potential for coalescence with Hethersett; and the historic setting of the town and Abbey. These should both be considered in the checklist. Given the status of the plan with the Government’s intention to revoke Regional Strategies it may be best to identify the services within the checklist and remove the reference to the East of England Plan. When assessing the results of the checklist it is important that all the sites are assessed fairly and equally. There is a danger that some of the sites do not score as well as others due to lack of information. The Council should take care to ensure appropriate and comparative weighting is attributed to each point.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11714 - Wrenbridge (Wrenbridge (Harts Farm)) [7364]</td>
<td>The checklist should set out whether there is a technical and deliverable solution to mitigate highway impact. The checklist should include an assessment of whether the site can reasonably deliver new/improved public transport facilities. Should include an assessment of the frequency of bus services and whether journey to work services are feasible. The checklist should include a box to acknowledge where site promotion agreements/joint ventures are in place.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current site checklist includes a general section on the costs of highways improvements. It is intended to consult Norfolk County Council Highways about the sites suggested for development and their advice will be followed regarding the acceptability of the development in highways terms and whether there is likely to be a technical and deliverable solution to mitigate highway impact. The current checklist includes a general section on public transport. In the case of large sites it will need to be considered through the site assessment process whether the site has the potential to deliver new or improved public transport. As part of work into the settlement hierarchy in the JCS a detailed assessment of the frequency of bus services and whether there was a journey to work service was made and this information will feed into the site assessment process. Whether a site is covered by promotion agreements/joint ventures will be explored at the detailed assessment stage and noted where relevant.
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr and Mrs Everett [6834]</td>
<td>No more sites, do not need more houses in Long Stratton, no work or jobs in Norfolk</td>
<td>The Site Specific DPD must be prepared to be in conformity with the JCS. The JCS states the number of houses that will be allocated at particular locations. The JCS allocates 1800 new houses at Long Stratton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr and Mrs Bowers [1609]</td>
<td>Brownfield commercial sites should be given priority</td>
<td>The site checklist in its current form is an information gathering tool. Further work is being undertaken on how to weight/score the sites based on information in the checklist and which categories should be given priority. Further information will be made available on how the sites have been weighted/scored at the preferred options stage so it will be clear why certain sites have been chosen as preferred sites for development and why other sites have been considered to be inappropriate for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr AL &amp; Mrs MRL Howard [1249]</td>
<td>It would be useful to have site sizes noted to help ascertain their usefulness</td>
<td>The site checklist has a box for site size to be noted. In relation to the maps there is an accompanying table of supporting information to be used in conjunction with the map and this gives the site size for each site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr R.M. Meadows [6408]</td>
<td>The Planning Authority must ensure that any approvals for housing integrate and enhance the character of the town</td>
<td>Comments noted. The site checklist includes boxes for current, previous and surrounding land use as well as tick boxes for whether the site is adjacent or removed from the settlement boundary. There are also many other categories on the site checklist and all of these will help to ensure that any sites chosen for housing development will be well integrated with the existing settlement and will not adversely affect the form and character of the settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council - Ecology, Flood &amp; Water (mr Ed Stocker) [6268]</td>
<td>It is understood that all relevant policies have been identified and will be considered during the site selection process. In particular, Appropriate Assessments will take place for proposed development near the European Special Areas of Conservation (Waveney and Little Ouse Valley Fens; Norfolk Valley Fens; The Broads; River Wensum) and Broadland Special Protection Area. More site-specific comments will be available at later stages of the LDF process</td>
<td>Comments noted. More site specific comments at later stages of the LDF process would be welcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentant</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6489 - Mr A Perry [6532]</td>
<td>Fine - no problem</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6130 - Dr Martin James Cameron [6400]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6437 - Mr A Truesdell [6510]</td>
<td>Adequacy of existing infrastructure - Hethersett already has parking issues, no NHS dentist, no bank - all creating travel needs</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ability of a settlement to accommodate additional growth has already been determined through the preparation of the JCS. Large scale growth in a particular settlement may lead to increased demand and therefore provision of infrastructure.
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>nt</th>
<th>ns</th>
<th>tati nI</th>
<th>ti n</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>ndix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The site checklist at Appendix 2 contains no indication as to the perceived relative significance of the various elements/designations described in that checklist. It would be inappropriate to proceed with the preparation of the DPD/AAP on the basis of a simple scoring system that does not take into account the potential significance of the elements under consideration. Furthermore, the checklist should take fully into consideration the fact that appropriate mitigation strategies will be entirely appropriate in the context of the development of particular tracts of land. In certain circumstances, this may mean the evaluation of different site boundaries to those shown via the current consultation exercise in order to exclude from the larger blocks of land those smaller areas which may give rise to limited, localised concern in environmental terms.

Page 10 of the present consultation document notes that the wider assessment will be undertaken within the context provided by the settlement hierarchy established in the JCS. In the particular circumstance of Long Stratton, Policy 9 of the JCS describes a growth location that is expected to accommodate at least 1,800 dwellings and the provision of a bypass for the settlement. The process described at page 10 of the consultation document should fully take into consideration the policy expectation enshrined in the JCS and the ability to deliver a bypass at Long Stratton.

In the light of the contribution that we have already made to the evolving JCS, we would maintain that the scoring of the potential of a particular site should take into account also those facilities that the landowner/developer has already committed, to the knowledge of SNC, to provide on that and related land. In evaluating the potential of the land described in this submission, we would anticipate that the assessment would acknowledge that development on the land concerned will deliver the bypass and enable Long Stratton to achieve the degree of self-containment anticipated in the Vision for the settlement prepared by the GNDP.

The robustness of the site checklist would be

In considering sites for development it will be recognised that mitigation strategies may be appropriate in the case of some particular pieces of land. The purpose of the site checklist is to gather information on the various sites that have been suggested. Further work will then take place to weight/score the sites.

None
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

significantly enhanced if, as noted above, it incorporated a mechanism by which appropriate weighting is given to key policy considerations. In the case of Long Stratton, we would suggest that the site checklist should clearly establish the appropriateness of a particular location in implementing the integrated development package for Long Stratton established in the JCS. Areas of land that can plainly contribute to a comprehensive and coordinated approach to the enlargement of the settlement should be perceived to essentially achieve a higher score than those that would give rise to a more dispersed development pattern, reducing the degree of coordination that should arise through the implementation of a whole settlement strategy. The tracts of land allocated to implement the objectives of the JCS should lead to the establishment of a self-contained town as described in the emerging Vision for Long Stratton prepared by the GNDP. In the context of the Long Stratton AAP, we would suggest that the Site Checklist should more directly reflect the nature of the development programme envisaged in the JCS. As presently drafted, the checklist may not lead necessarily to the identification of tracts of land which, taken together, can achieve a self-contained community which is able to benefit from the bypass and related aspects that form part of the policy base of the JCS.

As noted at page 6 of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, the Area Action Plans are expected to set out the detailed policies, phasing, infrastructure and delivery mechanisms for each of the target areas in order to ensure growth is delivered in a co-ordinated and comprehensive manner. This comprehensive approach aims to ensure that well-integrated, sustainable development takes place in

---

Object: The size/detail on the maps are too small. Proper maps should have been produced so sites could be clearly identified.

The Council produced the best and clearest maps that it was possible to produce at the time and given the large number of different sites that were being consulted upon. Each settlement had its own individual map as part of the consultation so all sites suggested for development in that location could be clearly identified and related to each other.
Q4 Do you have any comments on the site checklist that the Council will use when assessing sites?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>nt</th>
<th>ns</th>
<th>tahi n I</th>
<th>tn</th>
<th>App</th>
<th>ndix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nt tions</th>
<th>tur</th>
<th>in Is</th>
<th>nci</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>nt</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8661 - Mrs Beaton [7201]</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The checklists don't demonstrate the pressure the local services would be put under and the fact that the road network locally is inadequate to sustain increased usage</td>
<td>The settlement hierarchy in the JCS was prepared based on the level of services and facilities in settlements and their ability to accommodate growth. The site checklist looks at the services and facilities in the settlement and highways improvements. The detailed assessment of each site, with comments from statutory consultees such as Norfolk County Council Highways will flag up any particular issues related to an individual site</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6703 - Dr David Lovell-Badge [6395]</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support for site assessment checklist</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7662 - Kimberley and Carleton Forehoe Parish Council (Mrs C Moore) [7096]</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7969 - Mr Paul Eggett [6907]</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8778 - Mr M R Allsop [4169]</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9408 - J Martin Shaw [6022]</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8017 - Geldeston Parish Plan Working Group (Mr John Crowfoot) [7121]</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Good checklist that takes into account the variety and mix or services and facilities that should determine whether further housing, more cars and a greater population can realistically be supported by the settlement in question</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sustainability Appraisal Framework

### 1) Location principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++) / (+) / 0 / (-) / (?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term / Medium term / Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy promotes a sequential approach to new development and reduces the need to travel to services and facilities with commensurate reductions in emissions. JCS Policy 3 provides for the increased use of renewable energy.
### 1) Location principles (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td>Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy provides the potential for the re-use of vacant and derelict land with commensurate benefits arising from a reduced need for development on agricultural land.

### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

**Decision-making criteria**
- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice
- Water consumption per head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy enables the more efficient provision of a water supply network. The impacts of treated foul water discharges to water courses will be restricted by the combined actions of Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England and resulting development constraints.

### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head
- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

The benefits of reducing the need to travel, traffic and traffic emissions; the townscape and landscape benefits arising from the re-use of brownfield land and the ability to make the efficient use of water resources meet most of the environmental objectives (i.e. ENV3-ENV8).
### 1) Location principles (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- or 0)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy reduces the need to travel to jobs, services and facilities and improves their accessibility with benefits for social cohesion and reduced social exclusion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce unemployment overall?
- Will it improve earnings?
- Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects. Accessibility to jobs is covered by Objective S4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Decision-making criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0/-/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Location principles (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Will it reduce actual levels of crime?</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Will it encourage engagement in community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects. Human behaviour and community composition are separate issues to the allocation of development provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, educational, religious facilities?</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Improving the quality of where people live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td>The benefits of ensuring good access to services and facilities are significant in reducing social exclusion and providing for enhanced social cohesion in accordance with objectives S2 and S4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Improving the quality of where people live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td>The benefits of ensuring good access to services and facilities are significant in reducing social exclusion and providing for enhanced social cohesion in accordance with objectives S2 and S4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects. (Accessibility to health facilities is covered by Objective S4 while healthy lifestyles will be affected by design provisions such as green infrastructure and walking and cycling links).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1) Location principles (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (± / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term Medium term Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
  - Will it aid farming diversification?
  - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy with improved ease of access to jobs and town centres will assist the take up of jobs, the viability of established centres and boost the local economy.

### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy with improved ease of access will provide for a variety of business locations and premises.

### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy will improve their potential ease of access.
### 1) Location principles (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++) / (+) / 0 / (-) / -- / ?</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- 0 0 0

**Short term** | **Medium term** | **Long term** | No direct significant effects.

#### EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns

| + | + | + |

The location of development sites within and adjacent to settlements within the JCS settlement hierarchy will improve the potential availability of employment sites within the rural areas.

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

Enabling good access to jobs, services and facilities supports their continued viability and economic growth in accordance with objectives EC1-3 and EC5.

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**
Significant environmental benefits arise from reducing the need to travel, traffic and traffic emissions, and encouraging the re-use of brownfield land while providing for the most efficient use of water resources. Major social benefits arise from ensuring good access to services and facilities in reducing social exclusion and providing for enhanced social cohesion. Enabling good access to jobs, services and facilities supports their continued viability and overall economic growth.
## 2) Existing Land Use policy

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

#### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

**Assessing the impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:** No direct significant effects.

#### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

**Assessing the impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:** No direct significant effects.

#### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

**Assessing the impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:** No direct significant effects.
### 2) Existing Land Use policy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>● Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>● Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td>● Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>● Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td>● Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### 2) Existing Land Use policy (continued)

| 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Environmental Factors</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

Existing land use policies have positive environmental benefits from the reduction of traffic, the regeneration of townscapes and protection of the landscape with indirect benefits for the conservation of agricultural land pending their review. Most land use policies remain consistent with the NPPF.
### 2) Existing Land Use policy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++) / (+) / 0 / (-) / (- -) / (?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2) Existing Land Use policy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2) Existing Land Use policy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shopping, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve educational attainment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve the quality of where people live?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to school, education facilities or communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve satisfaction of people with their skills and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Ability to access GP services improving the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</th>
<th>Existing land use designations can continue to meet housing needs in response to Objective S1 pending new allocations to meet further growth requirements. Having been allocated in response to government policy to reduce the need to travel, existing allocations are generally in sustainable locations with good access to jobs, services and facilities with regard to Objective S4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### ECONOMIC FACTORS

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it retain existing businesses?
  - Will it aid diversification?
  - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment land allocations, defined primary shopping areas and central business areas will continue to provide a focus for the retention and provision of business opportunities.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment land allocations, defined primary shopping areas and central business areas will continue to provide a focus for the retention and provision of business opportunities.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.
### 2) Existing Land Use Policy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the Impacts (;++ / +/ 0/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC4:</strong> To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC5:</strong> To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment land allocations and town centre designations provide a focus for development with existing accessibility benefits. Longer term benefits will be subject to the state of the economy and the case for re-allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Effects Score:  ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**
Existing housing land allocations will continue to contribute towards housing need in the short to medium terms until they are completed. Employment land allocations and town centre designations have existing accessibility benefits and will have longer term benefits subject to the state of the economy and the case for re-allocation. Landscape protection policies may have shorter term environmental benefits depending on the outcomes of their potential review as part of the Development Management Policies review. All current development land allocations will provide opportunities for the use of sustainable transport as they have been adopted within the context of government policies to reduce the need to travel.
### Sustainability Appraisal – Site assessment criteria

**3) Undeveloped Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++) / (+) / 0 / (-) / (- -) / (?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
### 3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV4:** To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**ENV5:** To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**ENV6:** To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protection of higher grade agricultural land and the preferred development where possible of previously developed land in accordance with national planning policy will have continuous benefits for the potential enhancement of townscapes and landscapes.
### 3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ( (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?) )</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>+ % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>The protection of higher grade agricultural land and the preferred development where possible of previously developed land in accordance with national planning policy will have continuous benefits for maintaining these aims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>+ Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>+ Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>+ Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>+ Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The main benefits are the potential protection of natural habitats and wildlife corridors associated with prime agricultural land and the potential for the enhancement of townscapes and landscapes as a result of the preferences for predominantly brownfield sites. However as there are relatively few opportunities to provide for the proposed large scale housing growth areas on brownfield land, the potential benefits of this approach may be reduced..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0/-/-/-)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the number of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.
3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term Medium term Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**S6: To improve the health of the population overall**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.
### 3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives**

There are no direct significant effects on the SA social objectives.
3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>• Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td>• More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>• Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td>• Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>• Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td>• Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3) Undeveloped Land (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++, +, 0, -, --, ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

There are no direct significant effects on SA economic objectives.

### Key to Effects Score:

- ++ Major Positive
- + Minor Positive
- 0 Neutral Effect
- - Minor Negative
- -- Major Negative
- ? Uncertain Effect

### Overall Conclusions:

The main benefits are the potential protection of natural habitats and wildlife corridors associated with prime agricultural land and the potential for the enhancement of townscapes and landscapes as a result of the preferences for predominantly brownfield sites. However as there are relatively few opportunities to provide for the proposed large scale housing growth areas on brownfield land in particular, the potential benefits of this approach may be reduced.
## Sustainability Appraisal – Site assessment criteria

**Appendix 5**

### 4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant designations will have continual benefits for maintaining and enhancing the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources | Decision-making criteria:  
  • Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?  
  • Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources? | Indicator-based concerns:  
  • % of new dwellings built on previously developed land | Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures |
| ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use | Decision-making criteria:  
  • Does it conserve groundwater resources?  
  • Will it reduce water consumption?  
  • Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?  
  • What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD | Indicator-based concerns:  
  • Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice  
  • Water consumption per head | No direct significant effects with regard to this objective |
| ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling | Decision-making criteria:  
  • Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?  
  • Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?  
  • Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products? | Indicator-based concerns:  
  • Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head  
  • Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted | No direct significant effects with regard to this objective |

Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives
The relevant designations will have continual benefits for maintaining and enhancing the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment in accordance with Objective ENV 6.
### 4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations (continued)

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing the number of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

No direct significant effects with regard to this objective

### 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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

No direct significant effects with regard to this objective

### S6: To improve the health of the population overall

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

No direct significant effects with regard to this objective
### 4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7:</strong> To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S8:</strong> To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The relevant townscape and historic environment designations will have continual benefits as a basis for maintaining and enhancing the quality of neighbourhoods in accordance with Objective S8..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0/-/-/?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td>Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4) Landscape/ townscape/ historic environment designations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects with regard to this objective.

#### EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects with regard to this objective.

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

There are no direct significant effects with regard to this objective.

**Key to Effects Score:**

++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**
The relevant designations will have continual benefits for maintaining and enhancing the quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment in accordance with Objective ENV 6, and provide a sound as a basis for maintaining and enhancing the quality of some neighbourhoods in accordance with Objective S8..
### Sustainability Appraisal – Site assessment criteria

#### 5) Current Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts $(++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)$</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV1:** To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>ENV2</th>
<th>ENV3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>ENV2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5) Current Land Use (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Current Land Use (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indictor-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indictor-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indictor-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The re-use of vacant land in existing developed areas would reduce the need for greenfield development and its associated potential increases in traffic impacts on the countryside while enhancing townscapes in accordance with Objectives ENV 4, 6 and 7.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5) Current Land Use (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/ +/ 0/-/-/?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to public services e.g. community facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>Ability to create mixed and balanced communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to workplaces and urban areas?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>Residents' perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills</td>
<td>Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects with regard to this objective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5) Current Land Use (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The redevelopment of vacant land in appropriate locations would have benefits for the commercial health of town centres and the provision of sites available for existing business relocation and expansion.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The redevelopment of vacant land in appropriate locations would have benefits for the provision of sites available for new and existing businesses and the commercial health of settlements.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects with regard to this objective.
### 5) Current Land Use (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy | Decision-making criteria | • 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects with regard to this objective |
| EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas | Decision-making criteria | • Will it encourage rural diversification?  
• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?  
• Will it improve electronic communication potential? | Indicator-based concerns | + | + | + | The redevelopment of vacant land in appropriate locations would have benefits for the provision of sites available for new and existing businesses and the commercial health of settlements. |

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td>The regeneration of vacant land within settlements would have benefits for the viability of and accessibility to town centres and new and existing businesses in line with Objectives EC 1, 2 and 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Effects Score:**  ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**
The consideration of whether or not existing land uses are likely to continue and the potential for the regeneration of existing vacant land within settlements will have a wide range of benefits for reduced greenfield land take, reduced increases in traffic impacts in the countryside, the availability of well located housing sites with good accessibility to services, and benefits for the viability of town centres and new and existing businesses.
### Sustainability Appraisal – Site assessment criteria

#### Appendix 5

#### 6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term  Medium term  Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>ENV2</th>
<th>ENV3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity interest and sites subject to local, national and international designations will be achieved by their avoidance or where necessary, protection from the impacts of development through the implementation of mitigation measures in accordance with Joint Core Strategy Policy 1.

**ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>ENV2</th>
<th>ENV3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>ENV2</th>
<th>ENV3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.
### 6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscape and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscape, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ +/ 0/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice
- Water consumption per head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protection of sites of biodiversity interest subject to local, national and international designations including wetlands and the protection of other water resources will be achieved by their avoidance or protection from the impacts of development through the implementation of mitigation measures in accordance with Joint Core Strategy Policy 3.

**ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head
- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

The protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity interest subject to local, national and international designations including wetlands and the protection of other water resources will be achieved by their avoidance or protection from the impacts of development through the implementation of mitigation measures in accordance with Joint Core Strategy Policies 1 and 3.
### 6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the number of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

S6: To improve the health of the population overall

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Ecology/ Biodiversity/Geodiversity (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC1:** To encourage sustained economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC2:** To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td>Business start ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC3:** To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6) Ecology/Biodiversity/Geodiversity (Continued)

| 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it operate in way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no direct significant effects on the economic SA objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**
The protection of sites of biodiversity and geodiversity interest subject to local, national and international designations including wetlands and the protection of other water resources will be achieved by their avoidance or protection from the impacts of development through the implementation of mitigation measures in accordance with Joint Core Strategy Policies 1 and 3. This protection has positive environmental impacts but no direct significant effects on the social and economic SA objectives.
### 7) Contamination/ Pollution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts $(++) / (+) / 0 / - / -- / ?)$</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation | **Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity? | Indicator-based concerns
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value | Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures |
| ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding | **Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS? | Indicator-based concerns
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones | |
| ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change | **Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district | |

0 0 0 No direct significant effect

0 0 0 No direct significant effect

0 0 0 No direct significant effect
### 7) Contamination/ Pollution (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
  - 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
  - Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
  - Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
  - Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

**ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

The main environmental benefits are the protection of groundwater resources from potential development–related surface water run-off from contaminated sites pending the implementation of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.
### 7) Contamination/ Pollution (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **S2:** To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion |          |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| Decision-making criteria            |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| • 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? |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| • Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation? |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| Indicator-based concerns            |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| • % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country |   0      |   0                                          | No direct significant effect                                                                       |
| • Reducing the numbers of people unemployed |       |                                               |                                                                                                 |

| **S3:** To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment |          |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| Decision-making criteria            |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| • 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            |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                                 |
| • % of the population of working age in employment |   0      |   0                                          | No direct significant effect                                                                       |
| • Improving the level of average earnings |       |                                               |                                                                                                 |
## 7) Contamination/ Pollution (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantity where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. public facilities, education, health, leisure, open space, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of community services and facilities</td>
<td>Improving the mixed use of participative communities, e.g. through election turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Decision-making criteria

- **S7**: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity.
- **S8**: To improve the quality of where people live.

### Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

- There are long-term benefits of assessing sites against contamination and pollution criteria to reduce their potential adverse impacts on peoples’ health, with this reducing potential adverse impacts on personal health and peoples’ quality of life.
- It is especially relevant to the potential reuse of previously developed land which is encouraged by government planning policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
### 7) Contamination/ Pollution (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7) Contamination/ Pollution (continued)

| 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Effects Score:**
- **++** Major Positive
- **+** Minor Positive
- **0** Neutral Effect
- **-** Minor Negative
- **--** Major Negative
- **?** Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions**
There are long term benefits of assessing sites against contamination and pollution criteria to reduce the potential adverse impacts of their development on groundwater resources and peoples’ health and quality of life. This is especially relevant to the potential reuse of previously developed land which is encouraged by government planning policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
## 8) Flood Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25?</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The application of this criteria ensures the protection of development from the adverse impacts of flooding. The approach implemented has largely precluded sites within areas of Flood Risk 2 and 3 subject to the availability of suggested sites in flood Zone 1, the impact of the remaining assessment criteria and mitigations where required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td>Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

This assessment criteria ensures the protection of development from the adverse impacts of flooding by largely precluding sites within areas of Flood Risk 2 and 3 subject to the availability of suggested sites in flood Zone 1 and the impact of the remaining assessment criteria. This assessment criteria also ensures the avoidance of the potentially adverse impacts of flooded development on water quality and the ecological status of bodies of water.
### 8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5:</strong> To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6:</strong> To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>• Ability to access GP services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community's general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>Residents' perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td>The avoidance of potential development sites within areas of high flood risk avoids a wide range of flood related problems thus making a positive contribution towards local quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business start ups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The avoidance of potential employment development sites within areas of high flood risk avoids a wide range of flood related problems that could have significant adverse impacts on such employment sites’ development, operation and continued viability.
### 8) Flood Risk (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

The avoidance of potential employment development sites within areas of high flood risk avoids a wide range of flood related problems that could have significant adverse impacts on such sites’ development, operation and continued viability.

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**

Overall there are significant major positive environmental, social and economic benefits of avoiding flood risk areas affecting water quality, flood water run-off related ecological impacts on water bodies, general quality of life and the operation and viability of businesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ENV1                  | To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation | Decision-making criteria:  
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?  
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?  
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?  
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?  
Indicator-based concerns:  
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality  
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value | ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding  
Decision-making criteria:  
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25  
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?  
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?  
Indicator-based concerns:  
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones  
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones | ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change  
Decision-making criteria:  
- 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 energy and traffic?  
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?  
Indicator-based concerns:  
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes  
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district |
### 9) Hazardous Zone (Continued)

| 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td>Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, towns and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and towns, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0 /-/-/-)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

No direct significant effects.
### 9) Hazardous Zone (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures.
### 9) Hazardous Zone (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / ++ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>• A preference for sites outside designated hazardous installation protection zones would have positive benefits for residents’ health and life expectancy overall.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>A preference for sites outside designated hazardous installation protection zones would have potential long term benefits for residents’ quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A preference for sites outside designated hazardous installation protection zones would have positive benefits for residents’ health, life expectancy and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9) Hazardous Zone (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC1:</strong> To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EC2:** To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District |
| Decision-making criteria            |                                                   |             |             |           |
| 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            |                                                   |             |             |           |
| Assessing the availability of employment land across the District |
| Business start ups |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects. |

| **EC3:** To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth |
| Decision-making criteria            |                                                   |             |             |           |
| Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs? |
| 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? |
| Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas? |
| Indicator-based concerns            |                                                   |             |             |           |
| Travel-to-work by mode data |
| Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects. |
### 9) Hazardous Zone (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++) / (+) / 0 / (-) / -- / ?</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ECONOMIC FACTORS**                |                                                   |          |            |                                        |

#### EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- 0
- 0
- 0

No direct significant effects.

#### EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns

0 0 0

No direct significant effects.

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

No direct significant effects.

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:** The location of development sites outside designated hazardous installation protection zones would have positive social objective benefits for residents’ health, life expectancy and quality of life.
### 10) Public transport access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

| ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Decision-making criteria                         |                                                   | Short term | Medium term | Long term | No direct significant effect |
| • Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25 |
| • Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation? |
| • Does the proposal make use of SUDS? |

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

| ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Decision-making criteria                         |                                                   | Short term | Medium term | Long term | The location of development within 800metres of bus and rail services will provide for their use as alternative transport modes with consequential potential benefits for the reduction of traffic based air pollution. |
| • 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 energy and traffic? |
| • Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources? |

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

The location of development within 800metres of bus and rail services will provide for their use as alternative transport modes with consequential potential benefits for the reduction of traffic based air pollution.
### Public transport access (Continued)

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td><strong>The location of development within 800 metres of bus and rail services will provide for their use as alternative transport modes with consequential potential benefits for the reduction of traffic.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td><strong>The location of development within 800 metres of bus and rail services will provide for their use as alternative transport modes with consequential potential benefits for the reduction of traffic.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td><strong>No direct significant effect</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 10) Public transport access (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indic Peace-based concerns</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indic Peace-based concerns</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources
- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use
- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD

### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling
- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives
The location of development within 800 metres of bus and rail services will provide for their use as alternative transport modes with consequential potential environmental benefits for the reduction of traffic and its adverse environmental impacts including air pollution.
### 10) Public transport access (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/0/-)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10) Public transport access (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td>The location of development within 800metres of bus and rail services will provide for their use as alternative transport modes with significant benefits for accessibility to major centres, services, facilities and jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5:</strong> To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6:</strong> To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>• Ability to access GP services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10) Public transport access (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / -)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community's general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>The location of development within 800metres of bus and rail services will provide for their potential use as alternative transport modes with significant benefits for accessibility to major centres, services, facilities and jobs, and hence satisfaction with the quality of neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The location of development within 800metres of bus and rail services will provide for their potential use as alternative transport modes with significant benefits for accessibility to major centres, services, facilities, jobs, plus personal satisfaction with the quality of neighbourhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) Public transport access (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Specify, evaluate, and evidence the impacts of the project. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The vitality and viability of town centres and other employment locations can only benefit from the availability of public transport within easy walking distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The availability of public transport within easy walking distance of both jobs and housing areas will benefit the viability of employment locations and their accessibility. Reduced journey times can result from the provision of bus lanes and bus rapid transit which become more viable propositions in relation to larger scales of growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10) Public transport access (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++/+/-/?-?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic benefits will result from the availability of public transport within easy walking distance of both jobs and housing areas due to their improved accessibility. Reduced journey times can result from the provision of bus lanes and bus rapid transit which become more viable propositions in relation to larger scales of growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Effects Score:**  
++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions:**  
The availability of public transport within easy walking distance of both jobs and housing areas has the significant environmental, social and economic benefits of potentially reduced traffic and consequential adverse environmental impacts, improved accessibility to jobs, services and facilities, improved satisfaction with localities and benefits for the viability of town centres, employment locations and rural diversification.
## 11) Utilities

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>ENV1: Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site? Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development? Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest? Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
<td>ENV1: Indicator-based concerns: Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality</td>
<td>ENV1: 0 / 0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>ENV2: Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25 Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation? Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
<td>ENV2: Indicator-based concerns: Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td>ENV2: + / + / +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>ENV3: 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 energy and traffic? Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
<td>ENV3: Indicator-based concerns: Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
<td>ENV3: 0 / 0 / 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11) Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts $(++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)$</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENCOURAGING THE USE OF NON-CAR MODES OF TRANSPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>MINIMISING THE INSTANCES OF PARTICULATE, NO2 POLLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>LISTED BUILDINGS, SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENTS AND ALL OTHER HERITAGE ASSETS CONSIDERED ‘AT RISK’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11) Utilities (Continued)

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicator-based concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</th>
<th>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate sewage treatment and surface water drainage capacities provide the environmental benefits of the prevention of flooding and adverse impacts on groundwater resources and water bodies of ecological value. Adequate water supplies are a basic requirement of development and the appropriate location of development sites provides for the viable supply of water.</td>
<td>Adequate sewage treatment and surface water drainage capacities provide the environmental benefits of the prevention of flooding and adverse impacts on groundwater resources and water bodies of ecological value. Adequate water supplies are a basic requirement of development and the appropriate location of development sites provides for its viable supply. Utilities provision thus meets the requirements of objectives ENV 2 and ENV 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11) Utilities (Continued)

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

**SOCIAL FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / + / 0 / - / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td>The provisions of adequate sewerage, drainage, water supply, electricity and (if available) gas supplies, are significant factors contributing towards the provision of high quality housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td>• Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 11) Utilities (Continued)

#### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Decision-making criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

| | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No direct significant effect | | | |

#### 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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

| | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No direct significant effect | | | |

#### S6: To improve the health of the population overall

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

| | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No direct significant effect | | | |
### 11) Utilities (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria · Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime? · Will it encourage engagement in community activities? · Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns · Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime · Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria · Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns · Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td>The provisions of adequate sewerage, drainage, water supply, electricity and (if available) gas supplies, significantly benefit residents’ satisfaction with their neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives**

The provisions of adequate sewerage, drainage, water supply, electricity and (if available) gas supplies are significant factors contributing towards the provision of high quality housing (objective S1) and significantly benefit residents’ satisfaction with their neighbourhoods (objective S8).
### 11) Utilities (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / - ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
  - Will it help retain existing businesses?
  - Will it aid farming diversification?
  - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effect

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provisions of adequate sewerage, drainage, water supply, electricity and (if available) gas supplies, significantly benefit potential locations for businesses and their development.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provisions of adequate sewerage, drainage, water supply, electricity and (if available) gas supplies, significantly benefit potential locations for businesses and their development.
11) Utilities (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term Medium term Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC4:</strong> To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC5:</strong> To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The provisions of adequate utilities significantly benefit potential locations for businesses and their development thus meeting objectives EC 2 and EC 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

Overall Conclusions:
The provisions of adequate utilities has significant environmental benefits for flooding, groundwater preservation and water supplies in accordance with objectives ENV 2 and ENV 8, social benefits for the provision of high quality housing and residents’ satisfaction with their localities in accordance with objectives S1 and S8, and significant benefits for potential locations for businesses and their development thus meeting objectives EC 2 and EC 3.
**Services Accessibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term Medium term Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ENV1:** To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

- **Decision-making criteria**
  - Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
  - Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
  - Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
  - Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

- **Indicator-based concerns**
  - Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality
  - Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ENV2:** To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

- **Decision-making criteria**
  - Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
  - Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
  - Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

- **Indicator-based concerns**
  - Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
  - Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ENV3:** To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

- **Decision-making criteria**
  - 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 energy and traffic?
  - Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

- **Indicator-based concerns**
  - Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
  - Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

- The location of potential development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities promotes a sequential approach to site location where most services are centrally located within a settlement while providing the potential for the use of non-car modes of transport with benefits for reduced emissions.
## 12) Services Accessibility (Continued)

| Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria | Assessing the impacts (++/+ /0/-/-/? | Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce traffic volumes and the need for roads or improve the condition of the existing network?</td>
<td>ENV7</td>
<td>- Enhancing the quality of undeveloped land for future development</td>
<td>The location of development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities reduces the need for travel and provides for the potential use of non-car modes of transport with the consideration of overall traffic congestion and environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and the environment?</td>
<td>ENV7</td>
<td>- No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve the sustainability of sources of water supply and reduce the need for non-renewable resources?</td>
<td>ENV8</td>
<td>- Minimising the instances of industrial NOx pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td>ENV9</td>
<td>- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it protect the quality of landscapes and enhance the character of local areas?</td>
<td>ENV9</td>
<td>- Ensuring the number of designated or undesignated listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered 'at risk' are conservated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it incorporate non-car travel options in the overall transport network?</td>
<td>ENV9</td>
<td>- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>ENV9</td>
<td>- No direct significant effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td>ENV9</td>
<td>- The availability of services within easy walking and cycling distance reduces the need to travel, traffic and its adverse environmental impacts in line with objectives ENV3 and ENV4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

The availability of services within easy walking and cycling distance reduces the need to travel, traffic and its adverse environmental impacts in line with objectives ENV3 and ENV4.
### 12) Services Accessibility (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home | Decision-making criteria | • Will it reduce homelessness?  
• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?  
  • Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups? | Indicator-based concerns | • Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions  
• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effect |
| S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion | Decision-making criteria | • 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?  
• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation? | Indicator-based concerns | • % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country  
• Reducing the number of people unemployed | ++ | ++ | ++ | The location of new development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities reduces the need for travel, provides for the potential use of non-car modes of transport, reduces potential social exclusion and deprivation while offering opportunities for increased social cohesion through shared activities. |
| S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment | Decision-making criteria | • 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 | • % of the population of working age in employment  
• Improving the level of average earnings | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct overall effect. However note that employment accessibility is covered by objective S4. |
### 12) Services Accessibility (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>The location of new development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities including employment locations has major long term benefits for their accessibility by non-car transport modes.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5:</strong> To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>The location of new development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities including education facilities provides an appropriate context for improved personal educational and training attainments and their consequential benefits.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6:</strong> To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>The location of new development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities including health facilities will help people to make informed choices about their state of health. Healthy lifestyles are a personal choice aided by the potential to walk and cycle to services and facilities and being able to gain access to recreational facilities provided as part of green infrastructure.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 12) Services Accessibility (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?
  - Will it encourage engagement in community activities?
- Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime
- Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of new development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities should provide for increased engagement in community activities and the development of local community identity.

### S8: To improve the quality of where people live

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of new development sites within easy walking distance of important core services and facilities should increase personal satisfaction with the locality.

### Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

Easy walking and cycling access to jobs and services greatly increases their accessibility and potential use with benefits for reduced social exclusion, increased community interaction and attainment and overall satisfaction with a locality in accordance with objectives S2 and S4-S8.
### 12) Services Accessibility (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
  - Will it aid farming diversification?
  - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of new development within easy walking and cycling distances of jobs and services will support economic growth and the vitality and viability of town centres.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effect.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of new development within easy walking and cycling distances of jobs and services will support economic growth and reduce the length of the journey-to-work.
12) Services Accessibility (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC4:** To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Conclusions:**
The main benefits of this criteria are to support economic growth, the vitality and viability of town centres and other businesses, rural employment opportunities and to reduce the journey to work.

**Key to Effects Score:**
- ++ Major Positive
- + Minor Positive
- 0 Neutral Effect
- - Minor Negative
- -- Major Negative
- ? Uncertain Effect

**EC5:** To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns

The location of new development within easy access of jobs and services will support economic growth and minimise the length of the journey-to-work. Benefits in rural areas may be reduced however due to relatively low growth provisions in the villages and fewer public transport services.

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**
The main benefits of this criteria are to support economic growth, the vitality and viability of town centres and other businesses, rural employment opportunities and to reduce the journey to work.
### 13) Other material considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (;++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Ability to enhance and protect Ramsar sites, SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, CWSs and river quality</td>
<td>Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td>Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes</td>
<td>Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV1: Decision-making criteria
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

#### ENV2: Decision-making criteria
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

#### ENV3: Indicator-based concerns
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

#### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The noting of material considerations such as the impacts of sewage treatment works safeguarding areas have benefits for air quality and the ambiance of new development localities.

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscape and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscape, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

No direct significant effects.
### 13) Other material considerations (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consideration of the impacts of on site minerals availability and the location of minerals safeguarding sites can reduce the need for minerals extraction on agricultural land with its impacts on soil resources.

#### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

**Decision-making criteria**
- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice
- Water consumption per head

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head
- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

The main benefits are for air quality by avoiding sewage treatment works “cordon sanitaires”, and a reduced requirement for minerals extraction on agricultural land as a result of requiring the extraction of minerals on potential development sites (i.e. the benefits arising from the potential development of brownfield sites). (ENV6 and ENV7).
13) Other material considerations (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++, +, 0, -, - - , ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td>The provision of housing sites will rely on their deliverability, a significant material consideration requiring their landowner support. While the quality of housing stock and housing schemes will result from detailed design considerations, these will rely on site-related considerations including the presence of oil and gas pipelines and sewage treatment works safeguarding areas. These will have an impact on development site capacities and their potential layouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td>• Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce actual levels of crime/fear of crime?</td>
<td>Levels of crime and the community's general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: No direct significant effects.

### S8: To improve the quality of where people live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>Residents' perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>Residents' satisfaction will be enhanced by the confirmation by land owners of their suggested development sites viability with regard to development-related requirements. Residents' satisfaction will also benefit from the avoidance of sites within sewage treatment works safeguarding areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: No direct significant effects.

### Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

The main social benefits arise from the delivery of well designed housing developments ensured by land owner support (especially when accounting for the costs of development-related requirements), plus residents’ satisfaction with well designed schemes which would benefit most from unconstrained sites. (S1 and S8).
### 13) Other material considerations (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provision of employment and town centre commercial development sites will rely on their deliverability, a significant material consideration requiring their landowner support. While the quality of such new schemes will result from detailed design considerations, these will rely on site-related considerations including the presence of oil and gas pipelines and sewage treatment works safeguarding areas.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provision of employment sites will rely on their deliverability, a significant material consideration requiring their landowner support. While the quality of new employment schemes will result from detailed design considerations, these will rely on site-related considerations including the presence of oil and gas pipelines and sewage treatment works safeguarding areas. These will have an impact on development site capacities and potential layouts.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.
### 13) Other material considerations (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/-)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>+ + + The provision of employment sites will rely on their deliverability, a significant material consideration requiring their landowner support. While the quality of new employment schemes will result from detailed design considerations, these will rely on site-related considerations including the presence of oil and gas pipelines and sewage treatment works safeguarding areas. These will have an impact on development site capacities and potential layouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

The consideration of material considerations meets the economic objectives of supporting economic growth through the deliverability of sites based on their land owner support, and the consideration of elements that could have adverse impacts on design and layout including the presence of oil and gas pipelines and sewage treatment works safeguarding areas. (EC1, EC2 and EC5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key to Effects Score:</th>
<th>Overall Conclusions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++ Major Positive</td>
<td>The consideration of material considerations has the environmental benefits of ensuring improved air quality while reducing the need for mineral extraction on agricultural land (ENV5 and ENV7); the social benefits of satisfaction with the delivery of well designed layouts relatively unaffected by site constraints (S1 and S8), and the economic benefits of economic growth through the similarly based deliverability of employment sites (EC1-EC3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Minor Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Neutral Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Minor Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Major Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Approach to Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The table continues with similar details for other sites.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Availability</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Allocation</th>
<th>Land Use Potential</th>
<th>Other Material Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morley Hall Farm House, London Road</td>
<td>55 houses</td>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>0918</td>
<td>SHLAA site, not actively promoted for options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map</td>
<td>NCC Minerals - site not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site over 1ha, NCC Highways - well located, potential to be served by BRT, subject to suitable access would not object</td>
<td>SITE ALLOCATED IN PART FOR 150 HOMES. Development here may have some impact on views from historic town and abbey, detailed townscape analysis would be needed. National Trust covenant, developer would need to provide buffer zone. NCC Environment - adjacent to curtilage of Listed Building. NCC Health - site adjacent to flood risk area, water supply network issues, foul sewerage network capacity, surface water network capacity. Following site visit concern that development of whole site would be overly intrusive into the countryside and adversely affect historic setting of town and abbey.</td>
<td>Foul sewerage network capacity, land at Silfield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>150 houses</td>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>0183</td>
<td>Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation</td>
<td>Site de-allocated as SHLAA site, not actively promoted for options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map</td>
<td>SITE ALLOCATED IN PART FOR 150 HOMES. Development here may have some impact on views from historic town and abbey, detailed townscape analysis would be needed. National Trust covenant, developer would need to provide buffer zone. NCC Environment - adjacent to curtilage of Listed Building. NCC Health - site adjacent to flood risk area, water supply network issues, foul sewerage network capacity, surface water network capacity. Following site visit concern that development of whole site would be overly intrusive into the countryside and adversely affect historic setting of town and abbey.</td>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>35 houses</td>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>0251</td>
<td>Site de-allocated as the 2,200 dwelling threshold has now been reached on sites with planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission since the Preferred Options public consultation</td>
<td>Site de-allocated as SHLAA site, not actively promoted for options public consultation so is counted as part of the 2,200 dwelling threshold and shown on the Proposals Map</td>
<td>SITE ALLOCATED IN PART FOR 150 HOMES. Development here may have some impact on views from historic town and abbey, detailed townscape analysis would be needed. National Trust covenant, developer would need to provide buffer zone. NCC Environment - adjacent to curtilage of Listed Building. NCC Health - site adjacent to flood risk area, water supply network issues, foul sewerage network capacity, surface water network capacity. Following site visit concern that development of whole site would be overly intrusive into the countryside and adversely affect historic setting of town and abbey.</td>
<td>Land at Mill of London Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Name of Site</td>
<td>Land Use/Function</td>
<td>Current Use</td>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td>Size (ha)</td>
<td>Suggested by</td>
<td>Map Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE REJECTED see Site 1151b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0217 Wymondham Wymondham</td>
<td>Bradman's Road/Cavick Lane - Phase 2</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>c/o Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker &amp; Son LTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0252 Wymondham Wymondham</td>
<td>Land North-East Wymondham</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0426 Wymondham Wymondham</td>
<td>Norwich Common - Public Open Space</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE REJECTED see Site 1151c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE ALLOCATED IN PART - see individual site numbers below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE REJECTED as not possible to access unless through land at Downham Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE REJECTED. Water main crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE REJECTED as not possible to access unless through land at Downham Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Land Use Policy**

- Baker 096 NPA

**Landscape/Townscape/Other Material Considerations**

- Other considerations include site contamination/pollution, Brownfield/Greenfield, Site Archaeological Interest (HER), Service Availability (UTITLIES), Conservation Area, SSSI/Ramsar, Site contamination/pollution, Bradman's Road/Cavick Lane - Phase 2, Bradman's Road/Cavick Lane - Public Open Space, Norwich Common - Public Open Space, Norwich Common - Public Open Space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Settled Site</th>
<th>Assessed as</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Land Use Allocation</th>
<th>Article 4 Direction</th>
<th>Local Access to Services</th>
<th>Foul Sewerage Network</th>
<th>Open Space</th>
<th>Service Availability</th>
<th>Preferential Options Conclusion</th>
<th>Drawbacks of Site</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z1205 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT, remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0989 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1205 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT, remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0989 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1205 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT, remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0989 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z1205 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT, remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0989 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1026 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Wilford</td>
<td>Site has planning permission for 350 homes. Public comments - urban sprawl, traffic concerns. NCC Highways - OBJECT remote from settlement. WTC comment - site already approved for 350 houses. Foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>Site Area (ha)</td>
<td>Existing Land Use (RPA)</td>
<td>Existing Land Use Allocation</td>
<td>Reason for Rejection</td>
<td>Preferred Options Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0162 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0.86 Housing Osborne</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa g g g ggg 2</td>
<td>ALLOCATE - see site R1016. NCC Highways - issue of railway Silfield Road bridge, site could not be served by BRT. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site over 1ha. Land subject to 2 public enquiries for open space use. Site contamination/pollution for Tiffey Valley, including this site to be designated as a nature reserve. Public comments - need to retain buffer for WTC comment green open space/cemetery could be appropriate. Water supply network, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Development of this site will need sensitive mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 close by.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0231 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>2.35 Housing Miller</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g ggggggg A g GGGGG</td>
<td>g GGG ggggG gg aa r g g gggg 2</td>
<td>SITE REJECTED as forms buffer to screen development from B1172. Public comment - traffic concerns, landscape. NCC Highways - reasonably well located, potential to be served by BRT, subject to safe access would not object. Foul sewerage capacity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0382 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>1.26 Housing Smith</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g ggggggg a g GGGGG</td>
<td>a g GGG ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>SITE REJECTED. Foul sewage issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0170 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>69.15 Mixed use Holden</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>a ggggggg a A g R GG A gG G G ggggG gg aa g g g ggg 2</td>
<td>SITE REALLOCATED FOR UP TO 35 HOUSES. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Foul sewerage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Part of site in flood zones 2 &amp; 3, amend development boundary accordingly. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - best located, potential to be close to BRT, subject to suitable access would not object. Foul sewerage capacity issues, land at London Road/Wymondham. Remainder of site 09/1262 withdrawn scheme for 18 units. Site suggested for tourism and there is no requirement to allocate tourism sites in the AAP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0167 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham Suton Lane</td>
<td>8.67 Housing</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>SITE REJECTED due to the impact on the setting of Gonville developer London Road/Suton Lane. Public comment - traffic concerns. NCC Highways - reasonably well located, potential to be served by BRT, would not object subject to suitable access. Road, Wymondham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0174 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham Friarscroft Lane - allotment gardens (SNC Property)</td>
<td>0.87 Housing</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>SITE REALLOCATED. Site and buildings on Friarscroft Lane and Carr Lane subjected to a bid to purchase, site was in a good location to serve the town. Public comment - given an overall housing need, NCC Highways - reasonably well located, potential to be close to BRT, would not object subject to suitable access. For the reasons provided by the WTC comment green open space/cemetery could be appropriate. Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 close by.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0177 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>2.78 Open space</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g gg gg gg gg gg g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>ALLOCATE - see site R1016. NCC Highways - issue of railway Silfield Road bridge, site could not be served by BRT. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site over 1ha. Land subject to 2 public enquiries for open space use. Site contamination/pollution for Tiffey Valley, including this site to be designated as a nature reserve. Public comments - need to retain buffer for WTC comment green open space/cemetery could be appropriate. Water supply network, foul sewerage network capacity issues. Development of this site will need sensitive mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 close by.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0441 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0.16 Industrial</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a g GGG ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>ALLOCATE IN PART FOR EMPLOYMENT. Within Condon Sanitaire sewerage network capacity issues. Part of site in flood zones 2 &amp; 3, amend development boundary accordingly. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - best located, potential to be close to BRT, subject to suitable access would not object. For the reasons provided by the WTC comment green open space/cemetery could be appropriate. Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 close by.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>6.78 Public open space (SNC)</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>REALLOCATE No. 6 as a GP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0180 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0.14 Public open space (SNC)</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>REALLOCATE No. 10 as a GP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0185 Wymondham</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0.14 Public open space (SNC)</td>
<td>096 NPA</td>
<td>g g g g g g g g g g GGGGG</td>
<td>a G G G ggggG gg aa gg g gggg 2</td>
<td>REALLOCATE No. 4 as a GP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0438</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0438 Wymondham</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Support from landowner. NCC Minerals - not subject to safeguarding provisions unless site over 1ha. NCC Highways - relatively remote from town centre, reasonably located to employment &amp; Business and rail station on Browick Road. Adj to development boundary but separate by rail line. Foul sewerage network capacity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0473</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0473 Wymondham</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Lizard, development may be harmful to open aspect of Conservation Area. Flood zones 2 &amp; 3 nearby. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC confirm no need to safeguard RFD allocation. Adj development boundary, separate by railway line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A0010</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>A0010 Wymondham</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY EXTENSION to include part of site not in flood risk as site already has permission for one dwelling. Sewer crossing site - would need mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource issues, foul sewerage network capacity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0931</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>0931 Wymondham</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>SITE REJECTED as too remote from existing settlement boundary and services. NCC Highways - OBJECT, remote from settlement. Inclusion could depend on whether adj larger sites allocated. Public comment - traffic concerns. Developer support through consultation. Foul sewerage network capacity issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001a</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>1001a Wymondham</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>SITE HAS POTENTIAL TO BE ALLOCATED FOR MIXED USE/RETAIL AT LATER STAGE IN AAP PROCESS. Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Water resource issues, foul sewerage network capacity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>1048 Wymondham</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>SITE REJECTED. Public comment - needs to be located in a more accessible position. NCC Minerals - could not be located in flood risk area. The site was assessed as an SHLDP site for mixed use at the A0030 site. NCC Highways - needs to be further assessed in terms of transport links. Norfolk Wildlife Trust - concern at impact on River Tiffey and habitats, protected wildlife corridor would be needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1148</td>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>1148 Wymondham</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>SITE REJECTED. Public comment - not suitable for mixed use or retail. NCC Minerals - no SHLDP site for mixed use at this location. NCC Highways - site not suitable for BRT due to limited road access. Norfolk Wildlife Trust - concern at impact on River Tiffey and habitats, protected wildlife corridor would be needed. Local character and landscape - site needs to be further assessed in terms of its impact on the existing landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conforms with JCS settlement hierarchy for consideration of housing allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Suggested by</th>
<th>Map of Site</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central business area</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of Open Land ENV2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement Boundary</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Land Use Allocation</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Access to Services</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Options Conclusion</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil Pipeline</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Availability (UTILITIES)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sewage treatment works safeguarding</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAC/SPA</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport Access issues</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Park/Garden</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brownfield/Greenfield</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Zone</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site contamination/pollution</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Preservation Order</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected Hedgerow</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Mitchell 096 NPA</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SEE NEXT PAGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Options**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Preferred Options
  - Comments
  - Other Material Considerations
  - Landscape/Townscape

**Existing Land Use Policy**

- **Council Site Address**
  - 19.17 Housing
  - 0.45 Housing
  - 90.16 Mixed Use
  - Undeveloped

---

**Location Principles**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Ecology/Biodiversity
  - Site
  - Size
  - Site ID
  - Suggested
  - Suggested by
  - Map of Site
  - or number

---

**Preferred Options**

- **Council Site Address**
  - **Amendments to Preferred Option**
    - Small boundary extension to reflect existing consent
  - **SITE ALREADY IN USE**
    - Remove allocation but retain in development boundary. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. Public comment - concern about gravel extraction, access, dust and rail bridge. Landowner support - states already in industrial use. NCC Highways - close to facilities but would need access from Park Lane - requirement for junction improvement - issue of rail bridge, could not be served by BRT.

---

**SITE ALLOCATED FOR 150 HOUSES AS PART OF LARGER DEVELOPMENT FOR 1200 HOUSES AND SCHOOL**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Water through consultation, NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. NCC Highways - site relatively close to facilities, especially the station, part of the site would rely on access from Park Lane and would require junction improvements and upgrading. Development in this location dependent upon proper solution to traffic and flooding issues associated with rail bridge.

---

**SITE REJECTED**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Brownfield/Greenfield, would require mitigation by a site wide brownfield area. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. Public comment - concern about gravel extraction, access, dust and rail bridge. Landowner support - states already in industrial use. NCC Highways - close to facilities but would need access from Park Lane - requirement for junction improvement - issue of rail bridge, could not be served by BRT.

---

**SITE REJECTED**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Flood zones 2 & 3 nearby. NCC Minerals safeguarding provisions will apply. Support from developer - see planning application. NCC Highways, issue of过于 intrusive into open countryside and would not have a detrimental impact on historic setting of town/abbey or... Development in this location dependent upon proper solution to traffic and flooding issues associated with rail bridge.

---

**SITE REJECTED**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Water resource and supply network issues, foul sewerage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Developer support - buffer to A11. Site visit - views of abbey across fields.

---

**SITE REJECTED**

- **Council Site Address**
  - Water main and sewer crossing site, would require mitigation by protected easement/diversion. Foul sewerage network capacity issues, surface water network capacity issues. Developer support - buffer to A11. Site visit - views of abbey across fields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>Suggested Land Use</th>
<th>Suggested (Surname)</th>
<th>Map Ref.</th>
<th>NPA or RPA</th>
<th>Site conforms with JCS settlement hierarchy for consideration of housing allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Land Use Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Shopping Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central business area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area of Open Land ENV2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River Valley ENV3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone ENV6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection Important Spaces (IMP3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protected Rail Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brownfield/Greenfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Land Grade 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Park/Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Archaeological Interest (HER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Preservation Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancient Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protected Hedgerow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SSSI/Ramsar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Wildlife Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAC/SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site contamination/pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport Access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Availability (UTITLIES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Access to Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gas Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites on a Minerals Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mineral/Waste Safeguarding site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sewage treatment works safeguarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Article 4 Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NCC Transport View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Options Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Options Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendments to Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of Amendment to Preferred Option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wymondham AAP**

**C43: Page 302**
Mrs Carole Baker  
Planning Department South Norfolk Council  
South Norfolk House  
Swan Lane  
Long Stratton  
Norfolk, NR15 2XE  

9th February 2012  

Dear Mrs Baker  

The following comments are made on behalf of Wymondham High Academy Trust in respect of South Norfolk Council’s consultation on the Wymondham Area Action Plan. We look forward to the opportunity of discussing these points further with you in our meeting at 10am on Friday 9th March at your offices.  

Wymondham High Academy is in the middle of Wymondham and is at the heart of its community. Having a successful secondary school adds much to the attractiveness of Wymondham as a place to live and the success of Wymondham High Academy is recognised county wide and nationally. We firmly believe that the Wymondham Area Action Plan should have as one of its cornerstones, the successful development of the academy site and integration of it into any plans.  

We would also like to clarify the roles of Norfolk County Council Children’s Services and Wymondham High Academy in this process since the relationship between these two bodies changed after Wymondham High School converted to Wymondham High Academy Trust in September 2011. In summary the relationship is now as follows:  

- Norfolk County Council Children’s Services has ongoing responsibility for planning, providing and funding sufficient pupil places across the county. This is unchanged.  
- Wymondham High Academy Trust has a long term lease for the academy site and has primary responsibility for the planning and development of the site.  
- Norfolk County Council Children’s Services recognises that Wymondham High Academy is the main provider for secondary school (11-18 years) places in Wymondham.  

Given these points, we believe that it is crucial for South Norfolk planning to consult with the academy directly and not rely solely on consultations with Norfolk County Council Children’s Services to give a complete picture of how the academy site should develop and fit within wider plans for Wymondham town.  

Wymondham High Academy Trust in partnership with Norfolk County Council Children’s Services and Norfolk Property Services has developed a 15 year strategic plan to set out how
the academy will address the challenges of growing from the current 1650 pupils to 2050 pupils as Wymondham increases by 2200 houses. In the context of this strategic plan for the site, we would make the following points which we believe are relevant to the Wymondham Area Action Plan.

1. **Overall growth of Wymondham needs to be capped at 2200 houses or a new secondary school will be required.**

The strategic plan for the academy site can cope (just) with the currently planned 2200 houses which will bring an additional 400 pupils into the academy over the next 15 years. This will take the school to 2050 pupils which is right at the top end of, and arguably slightly above, what is feasible for a secondary school. Growth beyond this will require a more radical solution to secondary places in Wymondham bearing in mind the following.

- Splitting 11-16 education from 17-18 (sixth form) education is highly undesirable educationally. The academy would strongly oppose any approach which relied on this.

- Managing a split site, even for such things as playing fields, is very difficult for a school to manage and, again, would be opposed by the academy.

- The academy site itself is constrained on all sides and cannot develop other than to consume more of its playing field resources – which are already less than would be ideal for a school of 2050 pupils (see point 3 below).

The strong view of Wymondham High Academy governors is that the growth of Wymondham should be capped at 2200 additional homes.

2. **New development in Wymondham needs to be linked by safe pedestrian and cycle routes to the academy site.**

Pupils within 3 miles of Wymondham High Academy travel to the academy primarily by foot, bike or car – with public transport being poor to non-existent. Pupils beyond this limit travel by school bus in the main with a minority travelling by car. The academy, situated as it is within a residential area, is poorly served by roads and parking and we therefore encourage as many pupils as possible to travel by foot or bike and actively discourage travel by car. This policy also has obvious benefits in terms of health and the environment.

To help with this strategy we would strongly urge that the Wymondham Area Action Plan takes as part of its fundamental planning that any housing developments are linked by safe pedestrian and cycles routes to the academy.

3. **Extend the sports and play facilities within Wymondham.**

The academy site is 84,000m² in size. This is 36,000m² smaller than the recommended site size for a school of 2050 pupils of around 120,000m². This means that, although we believe we can cope with the smaller than ideal playing fields in terms of delivering the curriculum, the academy site cannot offer as much playing field space to the community as it ideally would.
To compensate for this we would strongly recommend the following:

- South Norfolk Council works with the academy to develop a shared all weather pitch adjacent to the leisure centre and on academy land. This development is part of the academy’s strategic plan.

- In addition to the green spaces that would be provided anyway as part of developing 2200 new houses, South Norfolk Council commits to providing an additional 36,000m$^2$ of sports and play areas to compensate for the shortfall in the academy site.

- South Norfolk Council commits to not allow development on any open green spaces within 10 minutes walking distance of the school. While no plans currently exist for the academy to use offsite playing field facilities, it is quite possible that these will be required in future. Development on sites that could be walked to from the school as part of a PE lesson should be strongly discouraged.

Yours sincerely

Alex Hunter
Chair of Governors

Victoria Musgrave
Principal
Appendix 8 – SA of options for housing growth in Wymondham – South Wymondham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

Sequential approach, adjacent to development boundary. Will provide new services and facilities reducing the need to travel for both new residents and existing residents in Silfield. Rail station is close by to encourage non-car journeys. JCS Policy 3 requires developers to maximise the use of renewable energy sources.
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

**Assessing the impacts:**
- Likely to be increase in traffic volume and congestion in short term. Growth to South dependent upon improvements to rail bridge which in the long term should improve traffic flow and accessibility to town centre. Less potential for Bus Rapid Transit than other locations but close enough to the rail station to encourage non-car journeys. Opportunities to maximise use of station as transport interchange could facilitate public transport improvements.

#### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

**Assessing the impacts:**
- No direct significant effects

#### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

**Assessing the impacts:**
- Although significant, major growth here would be fairly self-contained. It would not be overly intrusive into the open countryside and would not have any significant adverse impact on views of the abbey or the historic setting of the town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major growth in Wymondham will have environmental impacts, particularly the use of agricultural or Greenfield land. However policies in the JCS will seek to mitigate some of the potential environmental impacts by requiring all development to be energy and water efficient. Issues particular to South Wymondham:</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring negative impacts on the Lizard and Silfield Nature Reserve County Wildlife Sites are minimised</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring improvements to the rail bridge to mitigate negative traffic impacts</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (;++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects as Wymondham does not have any particular issues with deprivation, poverty or social exclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to employment opportunities covered by objective S4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM

#### Site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Will it provide new education, leisure, open space and community facilities.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Putting growth in one location makes it easier to deliver a new primary school.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Will improve accessibility to services and facilities for the existing residents in Silfield.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Well located in relation to job opportunities in town centre, Ayton Road and Bridge Industrial estate.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Close to rail station to facilitate access to employment opportunities further afield in Norwich or Cambridge.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5:</strong> To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Improving the level of school exam performance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td><strong>Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6:</strong> To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Ability to access GP services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to health facilities is covered by objective S4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site:** MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++/+/0/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S7:** To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?
  - Will it encourage engagement in community activities?
  - Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime
- Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects. Human behaviour and community composition are separate issues to the allocation of development sites.

**S8:** To improve the quality of where people live

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives**

Major growth in South Wymondham will bring positive social benefits in terms of providing much needed housing. Policies in the JCS seek to ensure that developers provide a mix of new housing with at least 33% being affordable. Concentrating growth in one location makes it easier to deliver services and facilities to support growth, in particular a new primary school.
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth in Wymondham will strengthen the local economy and help to support local business. Measures to improve the rail bridge will allow easier access to the town centre which will increase vitality and viability.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well located in relation to job opportunities in town centre, Ayton Road and Bridge Industrial estate. Close to rail station to facilitate access to employment opportunities further afield in Norwich or Cambridge.
### MAJOR GROWTH IN SOUTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas** |                                                   |                                               |                                                                                |
| Decision-making criteria           | Indicator-based concerns                         |                                               |                                                                                |
| - Will it encourage rural diversification? | • Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |
| - Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas? |                                               |                                               |                                                                                |
| - Will it improve electronic communication potential? |                                               |                                               |                                                                                |

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

Major growth in South Wymondham would bring growth benefits for local businesses. South Wymondham has the advantage of being close to the rail station and having easy accessibility to the town centre. It is also close to employment opportunities at Ayton Road and the Bridge Industrial estate.

**Key to Effects Score:**

- ++ Major Positive
- + Minor Positive
- 0 Neutral Effect
- - Minor Negative
- -- Major Negative
- ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions on site:**

Although putting major growth in South Wymondham would have some environmental impacts these could be outweighed by the potential social and economic benefits of one large housing development. South Wymondham has the advantage that it is close to the rail station and the town centre is easily accessible.

**Recommendations:** Site recommended as preferred option for major housing growth
### Appendix 8 - SA of options for housing growth in Wymondham – North Wymondham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>MAJOR GROWTH IN NORTH WYMONDHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV1:</strong> To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the proposal make use of SuDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN NORTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV4:</strong> To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely to be increase in traffic volume and congestion in short term although this could be mitigated by improvements to the roundabouts at Waitrose. Major growth in North Wymondham has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which could bring positive benefits, although these benefits would only be realised if the scheme goes ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV5:</strong> To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV6:</strong> To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major growth in North Wymondham is likely to have a negative impact on the strategic gap and the openness of land between Wymondham and Hethersett. This is protected by policies in the JCS. It is considered that growth in North Wymondham would be intrusive into the open countryside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

#### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major growth in one location will necessitate the use of agricultural land as there are not sufficient previously developed sites available in Wymondham to accommodate the proposed level of growth.

#### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

**Decision-making criteria**
- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice
- Water consumption per head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anglian Water has indicated that with strategic improvements Wymondham can accommodate the level of development proposed. To ensure sustainable sources of supply developers would need to demonstrate how they can resolve any particular water issues identified by Anglian Water. JCS Policy 3 requires new development to be water efficient and reach Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 (level 6 by 2015 over 500 dwellings).

#### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head
- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

Major growth in Wymondham will have environmental impacts, particularly the use of agricultural or Greenfield land. However policies in the JCS will seek to mitigate some of the potential environmental impacts by requiring all development to be energy and water efficient. Issues particular to North Wymondham:
- Impact on the strategic gap and the openness of land between Wymondham and Hethersett
- Requiring improvements to the roundabouts near Waitrose to mitigate negative traffic impacts.
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN NORTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (;++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Will it reduce homelessness?&lt;br&gt;• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?&lt;br&gt;• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?&lt;br&gt;• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?&lt;br&gt;• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?&lt;br&gt;• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Will it reduce unemployment overall?&lt;br&gt;• Will it improve earnings?&lt;br&gt;• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4</strong>: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>Will provide new education, leisure, open space and community facilities. Putting growth in one location makes it easier to deliver a new primary school. Will improve accessibility to services and facilities for the existing residents in the vicinity of Norwich Common. Well located to job opportunities at Gateway 11, the Police HQ and Waitrose but not so well related to the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5</strong>: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to education is covered by objective S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6</strong>: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>• Ability to access GP services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to health facilities is covered by objective S4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN NORTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/-/+/0/-/-/-)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7:</strong> To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S8:</strong> To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

Major growth in North Wymondham will bring positive social benefits in terms of providing much needed housing. Policies in the JCS seek to ensure that developers provide a mix of new housing with at least 33% being affordable. Concentrating growth in one location makes it easier to deliver services and facilities to support growth, in particular a new primary school.
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN NORTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+/-/+ /0/-/-/?)</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth in Wymondham will strengthen the local economy and help to support local business. An increase in population of the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre.

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well located in relation to job opportunities at Gateway 11, the Police HQ and Waitrose although less well located in relation to the town centre. Major growth in North Wymondham has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which could bring positive benefits and improve access to job opportunities, although these benefits would only be realised if the scheme goes ahead.
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN NORTH WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives

Major growth in North Wymondham would bring growth benefits for local businesses. North Wymondham has the advantage of being close to employment opportunities at Gateway 11, the Police HQ and Waitrose and has potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) if plans go ahead.

### Key to Effects Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>++</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Positive</td>
<td>Minor Positive</td>
<td>Neutral Effect</td>
<td>Minor Negative</td>
<td>Major Negative</td>
<td>Uncertain Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Conclusions on site:

Although putting major growth in North Wymondham would have some landscape impacts these could be outweighed by the potential social and economic benefits of one large housing development. North Wymondham has the advantage that it is close to employment benefits but has the disadvantage that it is more remote from the town centre. It has the potential to be well served by BRT, if the planned scheme goes ahead.

### Recommendations:

Site not recommended as the preferred location for major growth.
## Appendix 8 – SA of options for housing growth in Wymondham – West Wymondham

### 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 e.g. for mitigation measures

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>MAJOR GROWTH IN WEST WYMONDHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
<td>Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
<td>Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
<td>Growth in West Wymondham would not directly effect nature conservation sites of international, national or local value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
<td>Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25?</td>
<td>Would not impact directly on land in flood zones 2 or 3. To minimise risk of flooding developers would need to demonstrate how they can resolve issues identified by Anglian Water and resolve flooding issues under the rail bridge. New development would need to maximise the use of SuDS and JCS Policy 3 states that new development must reach Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for water (level 6 by 2015 over 500 dwellings). Long term impacts should be neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
<td>Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
<td>Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
<td>Sequential approach, adjacent to development boundary. Will provide new services and facilities reducing the need to travel for both new residents and existing residents to the west of Wymondham. Has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). JCS Policy 3 requires developers to maximise the use of renewable energy sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation |
| ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding |
| ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN WEST WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources**

- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision-making criteria**

- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use**

- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Reducing the number of waste being produced or requiring disposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling**

- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

**Indicator-based concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

Major growth in Wymondham will have environmental impacts, particularly the use of agricultural or Greenfield land. However policies in the JCS will seek to mitigate some of the potential environmental impacts by requiring all development to be energy and water efficient and exceeding JCS Policy 3 Sustainable Homes Level 4. Level 6 by 2015 over 500 dwellings.

Landscape impact on the historic setting of the town and abbey.

Requiring improvements to the A1172 to mitigate negative traffic impacts.

No direct significant effects.
### Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN WEST WYMONDHAM

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>++</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will provide much needed new housing and contribute towards meeting the ‘5 year housing land supply’ across the district. JCS policy 4 requires developers to provide a mix of housing and 33% affordable housing to meet housing need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the number of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects as Wymondham does not have any particular issues with deprivation, poverty or social exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to employment opportunities covered by objective S4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: MAJOR GROWTH IN WEST WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/ + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>Levels of crime and the community's general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects. Human behaviour and community composition are separate issues to the allocation of development sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S8: To improve the quality of where people live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>Residents' perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |

### Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

Major growth in West Wymondham will bring positive social benefits in terms of providing much needed housing. Policies in the JCS seek to ensure that developers provide a mix of new housing with at least 33% being affordable. Concentrating growth in one location makes it easier to deliver services and facilities to support growth, in particular a new primary school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>MAJOR GROWTH IN WEST WYMONDHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in Wymondham will strengthen the local economy and help to support local business. An increase in population of the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well located in relation to job opportunities at London Road Business Park although less well located in relation to the town centre. Major growth in West Wymondham has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which could bring positive benefits and improve access to job opportunities, although these benefits would only be realised if the scheme goes ahead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td>Major growth in West Wymondham would bring growth benefits for local businesses. West Wymondham has the advantage of being close to employment opportunities at London Road Business Park and has potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) if plans go ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conclusions on site:</td>
<td>Although putting major growth in West Wymondham would have some landscape impacts these could be outweighed by the potential social and economic benefits of one large housing development. West Wymondham has the advantage that it is close to employment benefits but has the disadvantage that it is more remote from the town centre. It has the potential to be well served by BRT, if the planned scheme goes ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations:</td>
<td>Site not recommended as the preferred location for major growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8 – SA of options for housing growth in Wymondham – spread of smaller developments around town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>SPREAD OF SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS AROUND TOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A spread of smaller developments around the town has the advantage that sites can be chosen that do not have any adverse impact on protected areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV2</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sites could be chosen so as not to impact directly on land in flood zones 2 or 3. To minimise risk of flooding developers would need to demonstrate how they can resolve issues identified by Anglian Water and resolve flooding issues under the rail bridge. New development would need to maximise the use of SuDS and JCS Policy 3 states that new development must reach Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for water (level 6 by 2015 over 500 dwellings). Long term impacts should be neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV3</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sequential approach, sites would be adjacent to development boundary, although sites unlikely to be big enough to provide services and facilities. JCS Policy 3 requires developers to maximise the use of renewable energy sources. Likely to increase traffic emissions as people travel to access services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: SPREAD OF SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS AROUND TOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ +/ 0/-/-/-)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term Medium term Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is likely to be an increase in traffic volume and congestion as smaller developments won’t provide services and facilities which people will then need to travel to access. Depending on location there is potential to reduce non-care journeys but only if sites located near to rail station or potential BRT corridor.

#### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

#### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A spread of smaller developments around town are likely to have less impact on the quality of landscape and townscape as it gives the opportunity to choose smaller sites that may make a positive contribution to the local area. It also gives a chance to use smaller derelict or previously developed sites. Smaller developments would be less visually intrusive in the open countryside.
### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?
- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land

### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

#### Decision-making criteria
- Does it conserve groundwater resources?
- Will it reduce water consumption?
- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?
- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice
- Water consumption per head

### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?
- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?
- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head
- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

A spread of development on smaller sites around the town would have fewer negative environmental effects and in fact can be seen as positive with regard to impact on landscape and townscape and the loss of agricultural land. Particular issues to consider:
- Potential increase in traffic volume and congestion as people travel to access services and facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>SPREAD OF SMALLER SITES AROUND THE TOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Factors</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</strong></td>
<td>Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects as Wymondham does not have any particular issues with deprivation, poverty or social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to employment opportunities covered by objective S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>SPREAD OF SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS AROUND THE TOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5:</strong> To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6:</strong> To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: SPREAD OF SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS AROUND THE TOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>No direct significant effects. Human behaviour and community composition are separate issues to the allocation of development sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td>Through election turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives**

A spread of smaller developments around the town will bring positive benefits in terms of providing much needed housing. Policies in the JCS seek to ensure that developers provide a mix of new housing with at least 33% being affordable. Spreading the growth over a number of smaller development makes it harder to deliver the services and facilities to support growth, in particular a new primary school.
Site: SPREAD OF SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS AROUND THE TOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
  - Will it help retain existing businesses?
    - Will it aid farming diversification?
    - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth in Wymondham will strengthen the local economy and help to support local business. An increase in population of the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre.

**EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

**EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A spread of developments around the town has the advantage of being able to choose sites near to employment opportunities or public transport to minimise journeys to work.
### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC4:</strong> To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC5:</strong> To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ECONOMIC FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives

- Housing growth in Wymondham would bring growth benefits for local businesses. A spread of development on smaller sites around the town has the advantage that sites can be chosen to maximise local employment opportunities and travel by public transport.

#### Key to Effects Score

- ++ Major Positive
- + Minor Positive
- 0 Neutral Effect
- - Minor Negative
- -- Major Negative
- ? Uncertain Effect

### Overall Conclusions on site:

Although a spread of development on smaller sites around the town has potential environmental benefits these could be outweighed by the negative social impacts of it being more difficult to deliver improved services and facilities, in particular a new primary school.

### Recommendations:

A spread of development favoured by public opinion, a larger development is needed to deliver a new primary school and other services and facilities but a spread of smaller sites should also be investigated.
Appendix 9 – SA of options for employment growth in Wymondham – Extension to London Road Business Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>EXTENSION TO LONDON ROAD BUSINESS PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>ENV1:</strong> To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td>Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site? Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development? Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest? Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td>Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25 Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation? Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 energy and traffic? Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
<td>Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>EXTENSION TO LONDON ROAD BUSINESS PARK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: <strong>To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: <strong>To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: <strong>To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

**ENV7:** To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>Development on a greenfield site adjacent to existing industrial estate but unlikely to be productive agricultural land so overall neutral impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ENV8:** To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>Anglian Water has indicated that with strategic improvements Wymondham can accommodate the level of development proposed. To ensure sustainable sources of supply developers would need to demonstrate how they can resolve any particular water issues identified by Anglian Water. JCS Policy 3 requires all new development to be water efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ENV9:** To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

The extension of London Road Business Park would have mainly neutral impacts as policies in the JCS seek to mitigate potential impacts of energy and water efficiency. Being a relatively small proposal and an extension to an existing industrial estate means it would be unlikely to have any significant impacts on the landscape or townscape.
### 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

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the numbers of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No direct significant effects as Wymondham does not have any particular issues with deprivation, poverty or social exclusion**

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The development of this site would provide additional employment opportunities in Wymondham to support the level of housing growth proposed for the town**
### SOCIAL FACTORS

#### 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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has the potential to provide accessible employment opportunities but would not improve accessibility to other key services so overall impact likely to be neutral.

#### 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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects (accessibility to education is covered by objective S4).

#### S6: To improve the health of the population overall

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects (accessibility to health facilities is covered by objective S4).
### LAND AT LONDON ROAD BUSINESS PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects. Human behaviour and community composition are separate issues to the allocation of development sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An extension to the London Road Business Park would have mainly neutral social effects other than the obvious positive benefit of creating jobs in the town and providing new employment land to balance the new housing growth planned for the town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: LAND AT LONDON ROAD BUSINESS PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>• Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td>• More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td>The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would strengthen the local economy and support and retain existing businesses. An increase in business activity in the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would provide a choice of locations for local businesses and add to the ready supply of employment premises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>• Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td>• Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td>++ ++ ++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>An extension to the London Road Business park would enhance the existing industrial estate and encourage the development of local employment opportunities. It is reasonably well located to the town centre and Wymondham in general and has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which could bring positive benefits, although these benefits would only be realised if the scheme goes ahead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>• Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td>• Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td>++ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site:

**LAND AT LONDON ROAD BUSINESS PARK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC4:** To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- 0 0 0 No direct significant effects

**EC5:** To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns
- 0 0 0 No direct significant effects

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

An extension of the London Road Business Park would have significant positive economic impacts. It would bring much needed employment land to the town to balance the planned housing growth and would have positive impacts for local businesses in Wymondham.

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions on site:**

An extension to the existing London Road Business Park would bring positive economic benefits with fairly neutral environmental and social effects.

**Recommendations:** Site recommended as preferred allocation for employment use
Appendix 9 – SA of options for employment growth in Wymondham – extension to Elm Farm Business Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects on any sites of internal, national or local value

### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would not impact directly on land in flood zones 2 or 3. To minimise risk of flooding developers would need to demonstrate how they could resolve any particular issues identified by Anglian Water. New development would need to maximise the use of SuDS and JCS policy 3 states that new development must be water efficient. Long term impact should be neutral

### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less sequentially preferable than other sites suggested for employment use although it is well served by public transport and has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit if proposals go ahead. JCS policy 3 requires developers to maximise renewable energy sources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve air quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the District's heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in the strategic gap but very small site closely related to existing development so unlikely to have any significant negative effect on the landscape or townscape but could potentially have a positive effect of enhancing the gateway to the town as approached from Hethersett, giving a feeling of entering Wymondham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

#### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>Land closely related to existing development at Elm Farm so unlikely to involve the use of productive agricultural land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>Anglian Water has indicated that with strategic improvements Wymondham can accommodate the level of development proposed. To ensure sustainable sources of supply developers would need to demonstrate how they can resolve any particular water issues identified by Anglian Water. JCS Policy 3 requires all new development to be water efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

A small extension to the Elm Farm Business Park would have no real negative environmental impacts despite being in the strategic gap. The proposed site is so small that it would have limited impact on the landscape and in fact could be viewed positively as enhancing the gateway to the town and giving the feeling of entering Wymondham.
**Site:** EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ - / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>Affordability housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/ +/ 0/-/-/?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to education is covered by objective S4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to health facilities is covered by objective S4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessing the impacts (++ / +/-/ 0/- /-/- /?)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7:</strong> To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects. Human behaviour and community composition are separate issues to the allocation of development sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S8:</strong> To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>An extension to the Elm Farm Business Park would have mainly neutral social effects other than the obvious positive benefit of creating jobs in the town and providing new employment land to balance the new housing growth planned for the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: EXTENSION TO ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++) / (+) / (0) / (-) / (-) / (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td>The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would strengthen the local economy and support and retain existing businesses. An increase in business activity in the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>• Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td>• More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td>The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would provide a choice of locations for local businesses and add to the ready supply of employment premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td>An extension to the Elm Farm Business park would enhance the existing industrial estate and encourage the development of local employment opportunities. Although it is located someway from the town centre and built up area of Wymondham it has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which could bring positive benefits, although these benefits would only be realised if the scheme goes ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>EXTENSION OF ELM FARM BUSINESS PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td>A small extension to the Elm Farm Business Park would have significant positive economic impacts. It would bring much needed employment land to the town to balance the planned housing growth and would have positive impacts for local businesses in Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conclusions on site:</td>
<td>A small scale extension to the existing Elm Farm Business Park complex would bring positive economic benefits with fairly neutral environmental and social effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations:</td>
<td>Site recommended as preferred site allocation for employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 9 – SA of options for employment growth in Wymondham – Browick Road

### Site:
BROWICK ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts $(++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)$</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV1:** To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

- **Decision-making criteria**
  - Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
  - Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
  - Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
  - Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

- **Indicator-based concerns**
  - Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
  - Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

| ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Decision-making criteria**
  - Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
  - Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
  - Does the proposal make use of SUDS?
| **Indicator-based concerns**
  - Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
  - Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

| ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Decision-making criteria**
  - 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 energy and traffic?
  - Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?
| **Indicator-based concerns**
  - Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
  - Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

Sequential approach to development, adjacent to existing settlement boundary and close to employment and residential uses. Good direct access to A11 and within close proximity to rail station, also potential for good links to strategic employment allocation at Hethel. JCS policy 3 promotes use of renewable energy sources.
### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++, +, 0, -, -, ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:

- Quantify where possible.
- Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures.

Easy, direct access to A11 is likely to reduce traffic volume/congestion issues for town and will reduce the impact of HGV traffic. Site is located reasonably close to the rail station but is not so well served by public transport so overall the impact should be neutral.

No direct significant effects.

No direct significant impact on the quality of important landscapes or townscapes. Development likely to be obvious when approached from the A11 but development here gives a chance to improve the gateway into Wymondham as approached from Hethel. Site is greenfield so development here would not reduce the amount of derelict land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>BROWICK ROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV7:</strong> To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV8:</strong> To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV9:</strong> To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</strong></td>
<td>The development of land at Browick Road for employment use would have mainly neutral environmental effects, apart from the potential negative impact of developing greenfield land. Policies in the JCS will seek to mitigate some of the potential environmental impacts by ensuring that all new development is water and energy efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>BROWICK ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  |  | Short term | Medium term | Long term | Quantify where possible.  
Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures |
| **SOCIAL FACTORS** |  |  |  |  |
| **S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home** | **Decision-making criteria**  
- Will it reduce homelessness?  
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?  
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups? | **Indicator-based concerns**  
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions  
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings | 0  | 0  | 0  | Employment not housing provision |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion** | **Decision-making criteria**  
- 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?  
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation? | **Indicator-based concerns**  
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country  
- Reducing the numbers of people unemployed | 0  | 0  | 0  | No direct significant effects as Wymondham does not have any particular issues with deprivation, poverty or social exclusion |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment** | **Decision-making criteria**  
- 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**  
- % of the population of working age in employment  
- Improving the level of average earnings |  |  | +  | The development of this site would provide additional employment opportunities in Wymondham to support the level of housing growth proposed for the town |
### Sustainability Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>BROWICK ROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessing the impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Has the potential to provide accessible employment opportunities but would not improve accessibility to other key services so overall impact likely to be neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to education is covered by objective S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S6: To improve the health of the population overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to health is covered by objective S4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td>Development of land at Browick Road for employment use would have mainly neutral social effects other than the obvious positive benefit of creating jobs in the town and providing new employment land to balance the new housing growth planned for the town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>BROWICK ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
  - Will it help retain existing businesses?
    - Will it aid farming diversification?
    - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?
- 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? | 
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Assessing the impacts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth**

The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would strengthen the local economy and support and retain existing businesses. An increase in business activity in the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre.

**EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District**

The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would provide a choice of locations for local businesses and add to the ready supply of employment premises.

**EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth**

Development of land at Browick Road for employment use would encourage local jobs. Located close to existing employment opportunities at Ayton Road and the rail station.
### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

#### Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ECONOMIC FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives

- Development of land at Browick Road would have significant positive economic impacts. It would bring much needed employment land to the town to balance the planned housing growth and would have positive impacts for local businesses in Wymondham.

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions on site:**

Allocation of land at Browick Road for employment use would bring positive economic benefits for the town. There would be some negative environmental benefits which could be mitigated and fairly neutral social benefits.

**Recommendations:** Site recommended as preferred allocation for employment use
## Appendix 9 – SA of options for employment growth in Wymondham - Sutton

### Site: SUTON Sustainability Appraisal

#### Objectives
- Investigating Question
- Decision Making Criteria

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

#### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- Sites are some distance from settlement boundary so not a sequential approach to development which is likely to encourage car travel and increase traffic emissions. JCS policies do encourage energy efficiency in new development.
- New development would need to maximise the use of SuDS to ensure water efficiency.
- Long term impact should be neutral.
### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:**
Quantify where possible.
Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites located someway from Wymondham and so employment development here would be likely to increase the need to travel. Location is served by public transport and has the potential to be well served by Bus Rapid Transit if plans go ahead, however not as sustainable as locations closer to Wymondham.

### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites too far from built up area of Wymondham to have any significant negative effect on the quality of landscapes or townscapes but neither would development here make a positive contribution to the local area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>SUTON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessing the impacts (</strong>++/*+/0/-/-/?<strong>)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quantify where possible.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENV7:</strong> To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on site, some greenfield, some adjacent to existing commercial uses, overall impact would be neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</th>
<th><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglian Water has indicated that with strategic improvements Wymondham can accommodate the level of development proposed. To ensure sustainable sources of supply developers would need to demonstrate how they can resolve any particular water issues identified by Anglian Water. JCS Policy 3 requires all new development to be water efficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</th>
<th><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives**

Developing land at Suton for employment use would have mainly neutral environmental impacts with some negative impacts related to the distance from Wymondham and the potential to increase the need to travel and therefore emissions.
### Site: SUTON

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Employment not housing provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

#### Decision-making criteria
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the numbers of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>No direct significant effects as Wymondham does not have any particular issues with deprivation, poverty or social exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

#### Decision-making criteria
- 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
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>The development of this site would provide additional employment opportunities in Wymondham to support the level of housing growth proposed for the town. However because sites are some distance from the built up area it is debateable whether it would improve access to employment and create a better housing-jobs balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>• Ability to access GP services</td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>• Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of employment land at Suton would be some way from the main built up area of Wymondham so it would not improve access to employment opportunities or other key local services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects (accessibility to education covered under objective S4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>SUTON</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment development in Suton would have mainly neutral effects with potential negative impacts regarding accessibility due to its location outside the built up area of Wymondham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>SUTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage sustained economic growth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</strong></td>
<td><strong>More VAT registered businesses in the District</strong></td>
<td>The allocation of new employment land in Wymondham would strengthen the local economy and support and retain existing businesses. An increase in business activity in the town could also help to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre, although this effect may be less with regard to Suton because it is located further away from the town centre than other potential sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>Travel-to-work by mode data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>SUTON</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (;++ / +/0/-/-/?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td>The location of employment development in Suton would have some positive economic impacts but also negative impacts in terms of accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conclusions on site: The allocation of employment land at Suton would have many negative environmental, economic and social impacts particularly related to accessibility and the need to travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations: Not recommended to allocate land at Suton for employment use as part of the AAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 10 – Other Policies and Proposals

#### Site: KETTS COUNTRY LANDSCAPE POLICY

| ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria | Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?) | Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:  
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation  
**Decision-making criteria**  
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?  
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?  
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?  
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity? | **Indicator-based concerns**  
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality  
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value | ++ | ++ | ++ | The purpose of the policy is to protect and enhance nature conservation sites and encourage habitat integration |
| ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding  
**Decision-making criteria**  
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25  
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?  
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS? | **Indicator-based concerns**  
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones  
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones | + | + | + | The proposed policy will protect some land in flood zones 2 and 3 from development |
| ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change  
**Decision-making criteria**  
- 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 energy and traffic?  
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources? | **Indicator-based concerns**  
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes  
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |
### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?
  - Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:**
No direct significant effects

### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:**
Protecting areas around the town from development has the potential to improve air quality and ambiance of the local area

### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

**Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:**
Protecting areas around the town from development will make a positive contribution to the local area by protecting the quality of the landscape and townscape
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>KETTS COUNTRY LANDSCAPE POLICY</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>• % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>• % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>• % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>• % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Water consumption per head</td>
<td>• Water consumption per head</td>
<td>• Water consumption per head</td>
<td>• Water consumption per head</td>
<td>• Water consumption per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>• Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>• Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>• Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>• Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape policy to protect important areas around the town from development has the potential to have major positive environmental impacts, particularly protecting the quality of townscapes and landscapes as well as protecting productive greenfield land</td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape policy to protect important areas around the town from development has the potential to have major positive environmental impacts, particularly protecting the quality of townscapes and landscapes as well as protecting productive greenfield land</td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape policy to protect important areas around the town from development has the potential to have major positive environmental impacts, particularly protecting the quality of townscapes and landscapes as well as protecting productive greenfield land</td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape policy to protect important areas around the town from development has the potential to have major positive environmental impacts, particularly protecting the quality of townscapes and landscapes as well as protecting productive greenfield land</td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape policy to protect important areas around the town from development has the potential to have major positive environmental impacts, particularly protecting the quality of townscapes and landscapes as well as protecting productive greenfield land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>KETTS COUNTRY LANDSCAPE POLICY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+ + + / 0 / - - - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1:</strong> To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2:</strong> To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3:</strong> To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: KETTS COUNTRY LANDSCAPE POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / -)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape Policy to protect important areas around the town would be likely to have mainly neutral social impacts other than on people’s ability to live healthier lifestyles and be more satisfied with where they live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: KETTS COUNTRY LANDSCAPE POLICY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ( (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?) )</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Table" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC4:</strong> To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC5:</strong> To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</strong></td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape Policy to protect important areas around the town would be likely to have a neutral impact on economic objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key to Effects Score:</strong></td>
<td>++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Conclusions on site:</strong></td>
<td>A Ketts Country Landscape Policy to protect areas around the town from development would have positive environmental impacts and fairly neutral social and economic benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations:</strong></td>
<td>It is recommended to include a Ketts Country Landscape Policy in the AAP to protect important areas around the town from development because of the major positive environmental benefits it would bring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10 – Other Policies and Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>STRATEGIC GAP</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>(++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?) Short term Medium term Long term</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposed landscape protection policy will not have a direct impact on nature conservation sites but does give the opportunity for habitat integration

### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct impact on any land in flood zones 2 or 3

### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>STRATEGIC GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>STRATEGIC GAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria | Assessing the impacts (+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?) | Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:
| ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS | Short term | Medium term | Long term | Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures |

### ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>++ ++ ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protecting areas around the town from development has the potential to have a positive effect on protecting productive agricultural land</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

A policy to protect the openness of the land between Wymondham and Hethersett has the potential to have some significant positive environmental impacts, particularly concerning the protection of landscapes and townscapes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>STRATEGIC GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/ + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOCIAL FACTORS

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the numbers of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>STRATEGIC GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ability to access GP services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protecting open space and improving access to the countryside has the potential to encourage feelings of well being and healthier lifestyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>STRATEGIC GAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + + Protecting open space and improving access to the countryside has the potential to encourage feelings of well being and improve people’s satisfaction with where they live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td>A Strategic Gap Policy to protect the openness of land between Wymondham and Hethersett would be likely to have mainly neutral social impacts other than on people’s ability to live healthier lifestyles and be more satisfied with where they live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ECONOMIC FACTORS

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td>Business start ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

**Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria**

**Assessing the impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ECONOMIC FACTORS

#### EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives

A Strategic Gap Policy to protect the openness of the land between Wymondham and Hethersett would be likely to have a neutral impact on economic objectives.

### Key to Effects Score:

+ + Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

### Overall Conclusions on site:

A Strategic Gap Policy to protect the openness of land between Wymondham and Hethersett would have positive environmental impacts and fairly neutral social and economic effects.

### Recommendations:

Include a Strategic Gap policy in the AAP to protect the openness of land between Wymondham and Hethersett because of the potential positive environmental effects this would have.
### Appendix 10 – Other Policies and Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site: PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE

### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/-0/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting existing open space has the potential to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment by ensuring that people have access to recreation without having to travel to find facilities further afield.

### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting existing open space has the potential to make a positive contribution to the local area by improving the quality of the townscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A policy to protect existing open space would have mainly neutral effects on environmental objectives although there is an opportunity to positively enhance townscapes and reduce the impact of traffic on the environment as people can access recreation in their own communities without having to travel further afield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site: PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE

### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include justification, comments and recommendations eg for mitigation measures

### Decision-making criteria

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

#### Indicator-based concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average housing completions per year against overall housing completions</th>
<th>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

### Decision-making criteria

- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

#### Indicator-based concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</th>
<th>Reducing the number of people unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

### Decision-making criteria

- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of the population of working age in employment</th>
<th>Improving the level of average earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
## Site:
PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE

### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

**S4:** To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need

**S5:** To improve the education and skills of the population overall

**S6:** To improve the health of the population overall

### Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | • Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?  
• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?  
| | **Indicator-based concerns** |
| | • Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities  
• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport  
| | **Assessing the impacts** |
| | **Short term** **Medium term** **Long term** |
| | ++ / + / 0 / - / - / ? |
| | **Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:** |
| | Quantify where possible.  
Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures  
| | **Protecting existing open space has the potential to improve accessibility to leisure and open space** |
| **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 for communities?  
• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?  
• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?  
| | **Indicator-based concerns** |
| | • Improving the level of school exam performance  
• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population  
| | **Assessing the impacts** |
| | **Short term** **Medium term** **Long term** |
| | 0 / 0 / 0  
| | **No direct significant effects**  
| **S6:** To improve the health of the population overall | **Decision-making criteria** |
| | • Will it improve life expectancy?  
• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?  
• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?  
| | **Indicator-based concerns** |
| | • Ability to access GP services  
• Improving the general life expectancy at birth  
| | **Assessing the impacts** |
| | **Short term** **Medium term** **Long term** |
| | ++ / + / +  
| | **Protecting existing open space has the potential to encourage healthy lifestyles and thus improve life expectancy**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime? / fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting existing open space has the potential for some positive impacts on social objectives particularly related to accessibility to leisure and recreation facilities, encouraging healthy lifestyles and peoples satisfaction with where they live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC1:</strong> To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC2:</strong> To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC3:</strong> To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage mixed use or live / work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: PROTECTING EXISTING OPEN SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas | Decision-making criteria | Indicator-based concerns |
| Will it encourage rural diversification? | • Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas? | Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns |
| Will it improve electronic communication potential? | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

A policy to protect existing open space is unlikely to have any significant positive or negative economic effects

Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions on site:**

A policy to protect existing open space would have fairly neutral environmental and economic effects but has the potential to have positive social impacts relating to improving people's satisfaction with where they live and encouraging healthier lifestyles

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended to include a policy to protect existing open space in the AAP because of the potential positive social impacts it would have
### Appendix 10 – Other policies and proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing new open space and improving existing areas has the potential to reduce the effect of traffic on the environment by ensuring that people have access to recreation opportunities in the town without having to travel further afield.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++/+/0/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

Providing new areas of open space protecting existing areas would have mainly neutral environmental effects other than potential positive effects on the quality of townscapes and reducing the need to travel by ensuring that people have access to recreational opportunities in the town without having to travel further afield.
### Site:
**PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td><strong>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td>Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing new open space and improving existing areas has the potential to improve accessibility to leisure and open space for local people</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td>Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td>Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td>Ability to access GP services</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td>Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td>Providing new open space and improving existing areas has the potential to encourage healthy lifestyles and this improve life expectancy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?
  - Will it encourage engagement in community activities?
  - Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime
- Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S8: To improve the quality of where people live

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing new open space and improving existing has the potential to improve quality of life and the satisfaction of people with where they live

**Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives**

Providing new open space and improving existing open areas has the potential for some positive impacts on social objectives particularly related to accessibility to leisure and recreation facilities, encouraging healthy lifestyles and peoples satisfaction with where they live.
### Site:

PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the Impacts (+/- +/0/ -/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
<th>Overall Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
<th>Overall Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects</th>
<th>Overall Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: PROVIDING NEW OPEN SPACE AND IMPROVING EXISTING AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td>Providing new open space and improving existing areas is unlikely to have any significant positive or negative economic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conclusions on site: A policy to provide new open space and improve existing areas would have fairly neutral environmental and economic effects but has the potential to have positive social impacts particularly related to improving accessibility to recreation, encouraging healthier lifestyles and improving people’s quality of life and satisfaction with where they live.</td>
<td>Recommendations: It is recommended to include a policy in the AAP regarding providing new open space and improving existing areas because of the potential positive social impacts that it would have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10 – Other policies and proposals

### Site: RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>No direct significant effect on any nature conservation sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV2</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>No direct significant effect on any land in flood zones 2 or 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**

- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV3</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>Proposed site is a sequential approach to development, however is likely to generate car journeys. If buildings on site maximise use of renewable energy sources as required by JCS then overall impact should be neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site: RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB

### Sustainability Appraisal

**Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**

- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed site is further out of Wymondham than the current site so it will not reduce the need to travel, however the proposed site has the potential to be well served by BRT so overall impact should be neutral.

### ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects.

### ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed site already has planning permission but is in the strategic gap. Although the site will be mainly open it could potentially have a negative impact on the quality of the landscape and the openness of the gap in this location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>The relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club to the preferred site at Norwich Common is likely to have some negative environmental effects, however this site already has planning permission. If the site with permission cannot be delivered then the Council would look to an alternative site with fewer negative environmental effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site: RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB

### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/- + / 0 / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
<th>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1</strong>: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2</strong>: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing the number of people unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S3</strong>: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A larger Rugby Club with improved facilities has the potential to improve accessibility to open space and leisure facilities for people living in Wymondham

**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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**S6: To improve the health of the population overall**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocation of the Rugby Club to improved facilities has the potential to encourage healthier lifestyles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td>The relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club will have mainly neutral social effects, although it does have the potential to have positive impacts in terms of accessibility to open space and leisure facilities and encouraging healthier lifestyles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sustainability Appraisal

#### Objectives

**Assessing the impacts**

| Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: | Quantify where possible. |
| Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Economic Factors

### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |

### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**

- 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**

- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |

### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**

- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**

- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<p>| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>RELOCATION OF WYMONDHAM RUGBY CLUB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the impacts</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+/ +/ 0 / - / - / ?)</td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ECONOMIC FACTORS

**EC4:** To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EC5:** To improve economic performance in rural areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

The relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club will have neutral economic effects

**Key to Effects Score:** ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions on site:**

The relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club to the permitted site at Norwich Common would have mainly neutral social and economic effects. It does have the potential to have some negative environmental effects but the site already has planning permission. If consent is sought for an alternative site then the Council would look for a piece of land with fewer environmental concerns.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended to include a policy within the AAP to allow for the relocation of Wymondham Rugby Club to the permitted site on Norwich Common, allowing scope for an alternative site to come forward if backed up by evidence.
### Appendix 10 – Other policies and proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: LAND FOR A NEW BURIAL GROUND IN WYMONDHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific site not identified but unlikely to allow a site which would have a direct impact on any nature conservation sites

#### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific site not identified but sites located in zone 2 or 3 flood risk are unlikely to be acceptable locations for a new burial ground

#### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>LAND FOR A NEW BURIAL GROUND IN WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0/-/-/±)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>The specific site for the location of a new burial ground in Wymondham has not yet been identified but the location will need to be carefully considered and therefore it is unlikely that there will be any significant environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOCIAL FACTORS

**S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td>• Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td>• % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td>• Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making criteria</th>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td>• % of the population of working age in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td>• Improving the level of average earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>LAND FOR A NEW BURIAL GROUND IN WYMONDHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/+ /0/- /- - /? )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5: To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6: To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to access GP services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site:** LAND FOR A NEW BURIAL GROUND IN WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts ((++ / + / 0 / - / - - / ?))</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S7:</strong> To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?</td>
<td>• Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td>• Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S8:</strong> To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td>• Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Although a specific site for a new burial ground in Wymondham has not yet been identified it would be unlikely to have any significant social impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site: LAND FOR A NEW BURIAL GROUND IN WYMONDHAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?</td>
<td>• Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help retain existing businesses?</td>
<td>• More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it aid farming diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage sustained economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it provide for a variety of locations for businesses?</td>
<td>• Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it add to a ready supply of employment premises?</td>
<td>• Business start ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it supporting targeted emerging employment types?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?</td>
<td>• Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is it located so as to minimise the journey to work?</td>
<td>• Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it enhance a group of existing employment generating uses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage mixed use or live/work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0 / - / - - / ?)</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although a specific site for a new burial ground in Wymondham has not yet been identified it would be unlikely to have any significant economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive + Minor Positive 0 Neutral Effect - Minor Negative -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conclusions on site:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although a specific site has not been identified a policy to allow land to come forward for a new burial ground in Wymondham would be likely to have fairly neutral environmental, social and economic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations: It is recommended to include a policy in the AAP to allow land to come forward for a new burial ground due to the fact that this proposal would be unlikely to have any significant environmental, social or economic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 10 – Other policies and proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF THE TOWN CENTRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations e.g. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?
- Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?
- Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?
- Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to enhance and protect SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites and river quality
- Limiting detrimental change to areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects on any nature conservation sites

#### ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will development of the site 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 by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone & passes Sequential Test & exception Test & requirements of PPS25?
- Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?
- Does the proposal make use of SUDS?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing the number of planning applications permitted in flood zones
- Reducing the vulnerability of planning applications permitted in flood zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects on any land in flood zones 2 or 3

#### ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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 energy and traffic?
- Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the provision of renewable energy generating schemes
- Reducing carbon dioxide emissions across the district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies to define the town centre will encourage a sequential approach to development and has the potential to reduce traffic emissions by encouraging people to use Wymondham town centre rather than travelling further afield to do their shopping.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF THE TOWN CENTRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/+ /0/-/-/?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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**
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

---

**ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

---

**ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

---

Defining the town centre has the potential to positively affect the quality of townscape by retaining an appropriate mix of uses within the defined town centre and restricting town centre uses else where in Wymondham.
### Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/-/0/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use | Decision-making criteria | Indicator-based concerns |
| • Does it conserve groundwater resources? | Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice |
| • Will it reduce water consumption? | Water consumption per head |
| • Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network? |
| • What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD |

| ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling | Decision-making criteria | Indicator-based concerns |
| • Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal? | Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head |
| • Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities? | Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted |
| • Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products? |

### Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives

Defining the town centre in Wymondham and restricting the location of town centre uses within the town has the potential to have positive environmental impacts, particularly with regard to reducing the need to travel and protecting the quality of the townscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++] / [+ / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce homelessness?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the level of activity available to young people in the District?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the numbers of people unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it support the development of Social Cohesion?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment overall?</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population of working age in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve earnings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the level of average earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment and help to create a better housing-jobs balance?</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defining the town centre and identifying potential areas for expansion could have a positive impact on reducing unemployment by providing access to job opportunities in the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>DEFINITION OF THE TOWN CENTRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0/-/-/? )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defining the town centre could have a positive impact on improving accessibility to shops and local services in the town. It could also improve access to employment opportunities e.g. retail and office jobs in the town centre.

**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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**S6: To improve the health of the population overall**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>DEFINITION OF THE TOWN CENTRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity | **Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/ fear of crime?**  
- Will it encourage engagement in community activities?  
- Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities? | Levels of crime and the community's general fear of crime  
Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |
| S8: To improve the quality of where people live | **Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?** | Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |
| **Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives** | | Defining the town centre and identifying potential areas for expansion could have some positive social impacts in terms of improving accessibility to shops and services in the town centre and increasing employment opportunities in the town |
### DEFINITION OF THE TOWN CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/+ / 0/- / -+ / -?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
  - Will it help retain existing businesses?
  - Will it aid farming diversification?
  - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining the town centre and identifying areas for potential expansion has the potential to increase the vitality and viability of the town centre and thus strengthen the local economy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Site: Site:

#### DEFINITION OF THE TOWN CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- 0 0 0 No direct significant effects

#### EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage rural diversification?
- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?
- Will it improve electronic communication potential?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives**

Defining the town centre and identifying potential areas for expansion could have positive economic impacts for the vitality and viability of the town centre and thus the local economy.

**Key to Effects Score:**  ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect

**Overall Conclusions on site:**

A policy to define the town centre would have some positive environmental, social and economic impacts particularly related to the quality of townscape, impact on traffic on the environment, accessibility to retail opportunities, reducing unemployment and strengthening the local economy.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended to include a policy to define the town centre in the AAP because of the potential positive environmental, social and economic benefits that it could have.
Appendix 10 – Other policies and proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>RETAINING AND ENHANCING THE DISTINCT CHARACTER OF THE TOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the effect of HGV traffic on people and environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it increase the % of journeys using non-car modes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Site:**

**RETAINING AND ENHANCING THE DISTINCT CHARACTER OF THE TOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td></td>
<td>% of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it conserve groundwater resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it reduce water consumption?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the supply of water be efficient in terms of the overall network?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is impact upon water quality? Will it improve ecological status of waterbodies as required by WFD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Environmental Objectives</td>
<td>Retaining and enhancing the distinctive character of the town centre has the potential to have some positive environmental effects, mainly on protecting the quality of the townscape and encouraging people to shop in Wymondham rather than travelling further afield thus reducing traffic emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOCIAL FACTORS

#### S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the number of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>RETAINING AND ENHANCING THE DISTINCT CHARACTER OF THE TOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td>Assessing the impacts ( (++ / ++ / 0 / - / - / ?) )</td>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?
- Will it improve access to employment opportunities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**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 for communities?
- Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?
- Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Improving the level of school exam performance
- Improving the vocational training amongst the working population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**S6: To improve the health of the population overall**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve life expectancy?
- Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?
- Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Ability to access GP services
- Improving the general life expectancy at birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/-/0/-/-/?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with cooperative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it encourage engagement in community activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8: To improve the quality of where people live</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining and enhancing the distinctive character of the town will have mostly neutral social impacts</td>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site: RETAINING AND ENHANCING THE DISTINCT CHARACTER OF THE TOWN

### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
  - Will it aid farming diversification?
  - Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Reducing business premises vacancy rates
- More VAT registered businesses in the District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment</th>
<th>(+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retaining and enhancing the distinctive character of the town centre has the potential to increase the vitality and viability of the town and thus strengthen the local economy</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- Assessing the availability of employment land across the District
- Business start ups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment</th>
<th>(+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Travel-to-work by mode data
- Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment</th>
<th>(+ / + / 0 / - / - / ?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>RETAINING AND ENHANCING THE DISTINCT CHARACTER OF THE TOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</td>
<td>Retaining and enhancing the distinctive character of the town would be likely to have mainly neutral economic impacts, other than the potential to improve vitality and viability and thus strengthen the local economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Effects Score: ++ Major Positive / + Minor Positive / 0 Neutral Effect / - Minor Negative / -- Major Negative / ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conclusions on site:</td>
<td>A policy to retain and enhance the distinctive character of the town would have some positive impacts such as reducing the effect of traffic and improving the quality of townscapes. It would have mainly neutral social impacts and some positive economic effects on the vitality and viability of the town centre and the strength of the local economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations:</td>
<td>It is recommended to include a policy in the AAP to retain and enhance the distinct character of the town because of the potential environmental and economic benefits it could have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 10 – Other policies and proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENV1: To maintain and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, species and habitat quality, and avoid habitat fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Will nature conservation sites of international, national and local value be adversely affected by development of the site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will development of the site increase the number or diversity of sites of nature conservation interest? Does it seek opportunities to integrate biodiversity into the development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it adversely affect sites of geological interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it contribute to achieving BAP targets and conserve/enhance species and habitat diversity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV2: To limit or reduce vulnerability to climate change, including minimising the risks from flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will development of the site minimise the risk of flooding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it help reduce the vulnerability of agriculture to changes in weather patterns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it promoting sustainable use of flood zones by ensuring that development is appropriate to the Flood Zone &amp; passes Sequential Test &amp; exception Test &amp; requirements of PPS25?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does it encourage habitat relocation or compensation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the proposal make use of SUDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV3: To maximise the use of renewable energy solutions and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it encourage efficient use of energy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it promoting a sequential approach to the pattern of development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will it reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases, including from energy and traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Will it increase the use of renewable energy sources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short term | Medium term | Long term | ENV1: 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effect on any sites of nature conservation value |

Short term | Medium term | Long term | ENV2: 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effect on any land in flood zones 2 or 3 |

Short term | Medium term | Long term | ENV3: 0 | 0 | 0 | Has the potential to encourage people to use rail as an alternative mode of transport but it will also encourage people to travel to use the MNR. The MNR itself will also create emissions so overall impact is likely to be neutral |
**Site:** PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY

### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+/ / - - / - -)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures

---

**ENV4: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment**

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it reduce traffic volume or congestion?
- Will it reduce the need to travel?
- 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
- Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has the potential to encourage people to use rail as an alternative mode of transport but it will also encourage people to travel to use the MNR. The MNR itself will also create emissions so overall impact is likely to be neutral

---

**ENV5: To improve air quality and minimise noise, vibration and light pollution**

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it reduce emissions of atmospheric pollution?
- Will it improve air quality?
- Can it improve the ambiance of local areas?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Minimising the instances of particulate, NO2 pollution
- Trying to avoid the need for Air Quality Management Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

---

**ENV6: To maintain and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of landscapes, townscapes and the historic environment**

#### Decision-making criteria
- Will it protect the quality of landscapes and townscapes, or mitigate the effects of inappropriate development?
- Will the site make a positive contribution to the local area, and enhance the character of local landscapes?
- Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and under-used land?
- Will the District’s heritage be preserved and/or enhanced?

#### Indicator-based concerns
- Listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and all other heritage assets considered ‘at risk’
- Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</th>
<th>PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY</th>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Short term/ Medium term/ Long term</td>
<td>Short term/ Medium term/ Long term</td>
<td>ENV7: To minimise the loss of undeveloped land and conserve and improve the quality of soil resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>ENV8: To improve water qualities and provide for sustainable sources of supply and sustainable use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it avoid the use of productive agricultural land?</td>
<td>• Will it minimise the irreversible use of soil resources?</td>
<td>• % of new dwellings built on previously developed land</td>
<td>• Planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency water quality advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0</td>
<td>• Water consumption per head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>ENV9: To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0 No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td>Overall the provision of a new station for the Mid-Norfolk Railway is likely to have fairly neutral environmental effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it result in less waste being produced or requiring disposal?</td>
<td>• Will it facilitate better community recycling facilities?</td>
<td>• Reducing the number of kilograms of household waste collected per head</td>
<td>• Increasing the % of waste that is recycled or composted</td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0 No direct significant effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it minimise consumption of resources e.g. use local materials and sustainably sourced products?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0</td>
<td>0 / 0 / 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Assessing the impacts (+/ +/ 0/-/-/?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantify where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**S1: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent, suitable and affordable home**

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce homelessness?
- Will it reduce housing need and ensure housing provision addresses the needs of all?
  - Will it increase the range and affordability and quality of housing stock for all social groups?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Affordable housing completions per year against overall housing completions
- Reducing the number of unfit private sector dwellings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**S2: To reduce poverty, inequality and social exclusion**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?
- Will it help to reduce levels of deprivation?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- % of the population living in the most deprived super output areas of the country
- Reducing the numbers of people unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects

**S3: To offer opportunities for all sections of the population to have rewarding and satisfying employment**

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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**
- % of the population of working age in employment
- Improving the level of average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Medium term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No direct significant effects
### Site: PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY

#### Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</th>
<th>Assessing the impacts (+ + / + / 0 / - / - / - / ?)</th>
<th>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S4:</strong> To improve accessibility to essential services, facilities and the workplace, particularly for those most in need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve accessibility to key local services e.g. health, education, leisure, open space, shops, community and religious facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to employment opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the effectiveness of public transport to service public facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S5:</strong> To improve the education and skills of the population overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to schools / education facilities for communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage opportunities for vocational skills training and improve local links with the workplace?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage lifelong learning and training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the level of school exam performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the vocational training amongst the working population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S6:</strong> To improve the health of the population overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-making criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve life expectancy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve access to high quality health facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator-based concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to access GP services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving the general life expectancy at birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium term</strong></td>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No direct significant effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site:
**PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY**

| Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria | Assessing the impacts (+/- +/0/-/-/? | Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: |  |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|  |
| SOCIAL FACTORS                     |                                                  | Short term | Medium term | Long term | Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures |

#### S7: To encourage local community identity and foster mixed communities with co-operative attitudes, helping to reduce anti-social activity

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it reduce actual levels of crime?/fear of crime?
  - Will it encourage engagement in community activities?
  - Will it contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Levels of crime and the community’s general fear of crime
- Ability to create mixed and participative communities, eg. through election turnout

| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |

#### S8: To improve the quality of where people live

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods?

**Indicator-based concerns**
- Residents’ perception of the quality of their neighbourhoods as places to live

| 0 | 0 | 0 | No direct significant effects |

### Summary: SA vs. Social Objectives

Overall the provision of a new station for the Mid-Norfolk Railway is likely to have fairly neutral social effects.
### Site:

**PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC1: To encourage sustained economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it strengthen the local economy and support emerging employment uses in the District (e.g. Research, tourism)?
- Will it help retain existing businesses?
- Will it aid farming diversification?
- Will it increase the vitality and viability of Town Centres?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing business premises vacancy rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More VAT registered businesses in the District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC2: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment promoting a positive image of the District

**Decision-making criteria**
- 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the availability of employment land across the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business start ups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EC3: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth

**Decision-making criteria**
- Will it encourage the development of local employment locations/jobs?
- 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?
- Will it reduce journey times between key employment/service areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator-based concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel-to-work by mode data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the reliance on accessing the workplace via private car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: PROVISION OF NEW STATION FOR THE MID-NORFOLK RAILWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating Question or Decision Making Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the impacts (++ / + / 0 / - / -- / ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Effects and Overall Assessment: Quantify where possible. Include justification, comments and recommendations eg. for mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC FACTORS</strong></td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC4: To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer the opportunity for more flexible working?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it operate in a way that seeks to minimise impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC5: To improve economic performance in rural areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it encourage rural diversification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it offer sources of employment in rural areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it improve electronic communication potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator-based concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planning permissions granted for business use outside towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No direct significant effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary: SA vs. Economic Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall the provision of a new station for the Mid-Norfolk Railway would be likely to have mainly neutral economic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key to Effects Score:</strong> ++ Major Positive  + Minor Positive  0 Neutral Effect  - Minor Negative  -- Major Negative  ? Uncertain Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Conclusions on site:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A policy to allow the provision of a new station for the Mid-Norfolk Railway would be likely to have mainly neutral environmental, social and economic effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations:</strong> It is recommended to include a policy in the AAP to allow the provision of a new station for the Mid-Norfolk Railway because it is unlikely to have any significant environmental, social or economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>