

Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Aligned Core Strategies

Combined document **Sustainability Appraisal Equality Impact Assessment Habitats Regulations Assessment**

Proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned
Core Strategies Publication Version
March 2014



Contents

1. Introduction	3
Aligned Core Strategies Proposed Main Modifications.....	3
Consultation Period.....	5
2. Sustainability Appraisal.....	6
Introduction	6
Development of the Sustainability Appraisal since the Publication Version	6
Sustainability Appraisal on the Aligned Core Strategies Proposed Main Modifications	7
Appraising the revised Aligned Core Strategies Policies.....	17
Main Impacts of the Aligned Core Strategies Proposed Main Modifications on Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	19
Conclusions.....	25
3. Equality Impact Assessment.....	26
4. Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	33
Appendix 1: Refined Sustainability Appraisal Framework.....	34
Appendix 2: Appraisals	37
Appraisal Mod1 – Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development....	37
Appraisal Mod2 – Policy 1: Climate Change	40
Appraisal Mod3 – Justification paragraphs 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b (tranche trajectory) .	42
Appraisal Mod3 – Justification paragraphs 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b (flat trajectory)	43
Appraisal Mod4 – Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Main Built Up Area	46
Appraisal Mod5 – Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Key Settlements for Growth.....	48
Appraisal Mod7 – Strategic Location at Boots/Severn Trent.....	50
Appraisal Mod8 – Strategic Location for Growth in the Vicinity of the proposed HS2 station at Toton for minimum of 500 homes	53
Appraisal Mod9 – New Strategic Allocation at Teal Close, Netherfield for 830 homes	55
Appraisal Mod10 – Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be identified as a Strategic Location for at least 600 homes	57
Appraisal Mod11 – North of Papplewick Lane (reduction of homes to 300)	60
Appraisal Mod12 – Brinsley (reduction of homes to 150).....	62
Appraisal Mod13 – Eastwood (reduction of homes to 1,250)	64
Appraisal Mod14 – Bestwood Village (reduction of homes to 260)	66
Appraisal Mod15 – Calverton (reduction of homes to 1055)	68
Appraisal Mod16 – Ravenshead (reduction of homes to 330).....	70
Appraisal Mod18 – Policy 3: The Green Belt.....	73

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City have produced this combined document to assess the impact of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version on the Sustainability Appraisal, Equality Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- 1.2 This document has been published alongside the Schedule of Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version.

Aligned Core Strategies Proposed Main Modifications

- 1.3 The Schedule of Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version relates to the 35 proposed Main Modifications. The summary of the proposed Main Modifications is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Main Modifications

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications
Mod1	<u>Main Modification 1 – Insertion of Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</u> Add new policy
Mod2	<u>Main Modification 2 – Changes to Policy 1: Climate Change</u> Amend policy wording and justification text
Mod3	<u>Main Modification 3 – Changes to the Delivery Table in Policy 2</u> Amend policy wording (and update housing figures), add and amend justification text in Policy 2
Mod4	<u>Main Modification 4 – Changes to Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Main Built Up Area</u> Amend policy wording (and update housing figures) in Policy 2
Mod5	<u>Main Modification 5 – Changes to Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Key Settlements for Growth</u> Amend policy wording (and update housing figures) in Policy 2
Mod6	<u>Main Modification 6 – Changes to Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy (matters not covered by Mod3, Mod4 and Mod5)</u> Amend policy wording, footnote and justification text
Mod7	<u>Main Modification 7 – Site Specific Changes to Strategic Location at Boots/Severn Trent</u> Amend policy wording and footnote in Policy 2 Update Appendix A
Mod8	<u>Main Modification 8 – Site Specific – Consequences of Strategic Location for Growth in the Vicinity of the proposed HS2 station at Toton for minimum of 500 homes</u> Add new strategic location for growth, add and amend policy wording, add and amend justification text in Policy 2 Add justification text in Policy 3 Amend policy wording and add justification text in Policy 4 Amend policy wording in Policy 15 and add justification text in Policy 15 Add justification text in Policy 16 Update Appendix A

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications
Mod9	<u>Main Modification 9 – Site Specific – New Strategic Allocation at Teal Close, Netherfield for 830 homes</u> Amend spatial objective Add new strategic allocation, add and amend policy wording, add and amend justification text in Policy 2 Amend policy wording in Policy 4 Add justification text in Policy 16 Update Appendix A
Mod10	<u>Main Modification 10 – Site Specific – Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be identified as a Strategic Location for at least 600 homes</u> Amend spatial objectives Amend policy wording and justification text in Policy 2 Amend policy wording in Policy 4, Policy 6 and Policy 7 Update Appendix A and Appendix B
Mod11	<u>Main Modification 11 – Site Specific Changes to North of Papplewick Lane (reduction of homes to 300)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A
Mod12	<u>Main Modification 12 – Site Specific Changes to Brinsley (reduction of homes to 150)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A
Mod13	<u>Main Modification 13 – Site Specific Changes to Eastwood (reduction of homes to 1,250)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A
Mod14	<u>Main Modification 14 – Site Specific Changes to Bestwood Village (reduction of homes to 260)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A
Mod15	<u>Main Modification 15 – Site Specific Changes to Calverton (reduction of homes to 1055)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A
Mod16	<u>Main Modification 16 – Site Specific Changes to Ravenshead (reduction of homes to 330)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A
Mod17	<u>Main Modification 17 – Review of Plan (new Policy 2.8 and new Section 20)</u> Amend policy wording in Policy 2. Add new section (Key Monitoring Indicators)
Mod18	<u>Main Modification 18 – Changes to Policy 3: The Green Belt</u> Amend policy wording and justification text
Mod19	<u>Main Modification 19 – Changes to Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development</u> Amend policy wording (and update employment figures), justification text and monitoring arrangements
Mod20	<u>Main Modification 20– Changes to Policy 5: Nottingham City Centre</u> Amend policy wording and justification text
Mod21	<u>Main Modification 21– Changes to Policy 6: Role of Town and Local Centres</u> Amend policy wording
Mod22	<u>Main Modification 22– Changes to Policy 7: Regeneration</u> Amend justification text
Mod23	<u>Main Modification 23– Changes to Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice</u> Amend policy wording and justification text
Mod24	<u>Main Modification 24– Changes to Policy 9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</u> Amend policy wording
Mod25	<u>Main Modification 25– Changes to Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity</u> Amend policy wording
Mod26	<u>Main Modification 26– Changes to Policy 11: The Historic Environment</u> Amend policy wording

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications
Mod27	<u>Main Modification 27– Changes to Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles</u> Amend policy wording
Mod28	<u>Main Modification 28– Changes to Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport</u> Amend policy wording
Mod29	<u>Main Modification 29– Changes to Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand</u> Amend policy wording and justification text
Mod30	<u>Main Modification 30– Changes to Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities</u> Amend policy wording
Mod31	<u>Main Modification 31– Changes to Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space</u> Amend policy wording and monitoring arrangements
Mod32	<u>Main Modification 32– Changes to Policy 17: Biodiversity</u> Amend policy wording and monitoring arrangements
Mod33	<u>Main Modification 33– Changes to Policy 18: Infrastructure</u> Add justification text
Mod34	<u>Main Modification 34– Changes to Policy 19: Developer Contributions</u> Amend policy wording
Mod35	<u>Main Modification 35– Amendment to Appendix C (Trajectories) to reflect changes to Policy 2</u> Update housing trajectories

Consultation Period

- 1.4 The Councils are consulting on the Schedule of Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version together with this combined document (Sustainability Appraisal, Equality Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment) for a period of at least 6 weeks commencing Monday 17th March 2014.
- 1.5 All stakeholders must submit their representations by **5pm on Wednesday 30th April 2014**.
- 1.6 Submissions can be made to the Councils to which their representations most directly relates:

Broxtowe – www.broxtowe.gov.uk/corestrategy

Gedling – www.gedling.gov.uk/gedlingcorestrategy

Nottingham City – <http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/localplan>

2. Sustainability Appraisal

Introduction

- 2.1 This document supplements the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version to the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies for Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City.
- 2.2 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal of the proposals in development plan documents and to prepare a report of the findings of that appraisal. Through the Sustainability Appraisal process, the local planning authority must assess the social, economic and environmental impacts arising from the proposals within the development plan document. The Aligned Core Strategies are development plan documents and therefore have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal at each of the key stages in their preparation.
- 2.3 The aim of this stage of the Sustainability Appraisal process is to determine whether there are likely to be any significant sustainability effects arising from the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version.
- 2.4 This document therefore presents the results of the appraisal of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies.

Development of the Sustainability Appraisal since the Publication Version

- 2.5 The Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version ([CD/REG/06](#) and [CD/REG/08](#)) was published alongside the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version in June 2012. Erewash Borough Council was formerly part of the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version but since then submitted its own Core Strategy for examination in November 2012 which was adopted (subject to no High Court challenge) by Erewash Borough Council in March 2014. The proposed changes to the Aligned Core Strategies and the appraisals on the proposed changes now only relate to the three local authorities of Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City.
- 2.6 The Aligned Core Strategies for Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in June 2013 which started the examination process. A number of proposed modifications were submitted to be considered as part of the examination process. Subsequent to the Publication Version report, a new Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development was proposed. An addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version ([CD/REG/09](#)) was published alongside the Aligned Core Strategies which presents the results of the appraisal of the proposed modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies, including the full appraisal of the new Policy A. The addendum concluded that the proposed changes to the 19 policies were not substantive enough to require further

appraisal. A number of comments were received on the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version and amendments were made in the light of comments received. Gedling Borough Council made some very minor changes to their part of the SA which did not change the overall sustainability results for Gedling. Broxtowe Borough Council received some comments but none of which were considered substantive enough to require significant amendment to their part of the SA. The addendum provides a summary of comments received and the officer responses to those comments plus commentary on the updates to the baseline data and characteristics.

- 2.7 Broxtowe Borough Council published a separate addendum ([CD/REG/10](#)) which considered the inclusion of the land in the vicinity of the proposed HS2 Station as a Strategic Location for Growth in a direct response to the announcement in January 2013 by the Secretary of State for Transport that Toton Sidings was the preferred location for a High Speed 2 (HS2) Hub station to serve the East Midlands. The proposed inclusion of the Strategic Location for Growth proposed at Toton was submitted to be considered as part of the examination process.
- 2.8 The public hearing sessions took place during October and November 2013. After the hearing sessions, a note from the Inspector ([CD/EX/27](#)) was sent to the three Councils asking them to undertake further work regarding the distribution of new housing in Gedling, providing additional details on development at Toton and the likely impact of this on other sites and locations in Broxtowe and the monitoring and review of the Aligned Core Strategies. Both Gedling and Broxtowe Borough Councils submitted detailed modifications ([CD/EX/35](#) and [CD/EX/48](#)) plus the Sustainability Appraisal reports ([CD/EX/36](#) and [CD/EX/38](#)) in response to the Inspector's note.
- 2.9 Additional public hearing sessions were then scheduled by the Inspector and took place in February 2014 to discuss the changes proposed by the Councils in response to the Inspector's note.
- 2.10 In the light of the consultation comments received throughout the development of the Aligned Core Strategies and discussions at the hearing sessions, the Councils have considered a number of proposed changes to the Aligned Core Strategies. The Councils have also undertaken further appraisal work to assess the impact of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies. This document presents the results of the appraisal of the proposed Main Modifications and should be read in conjunction with the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version report (June 2012).

Sustainability Appraisal on the Aligned Core Strategies Proposed Main Modifications

- 2.11 The process of appraising the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version involved an initial screening phase to 'scope' for those changes to policy that would be likely to have sustainability implications.

2.12 The SA team for the three councils assessed each of the 35 proposed Main Modifications to consider the impact that each modification may have on the content of the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The screening exercise concluded that further appraisals were required as a consequence of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies and are as follows:

- Mod2 – changes to Policy 1: Climate Change
- Mod3 – new justification paragraphs 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b in Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy
- Mod4 – changes to overall housing target for Main Built Up Area in Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy
- Mod5 – changes to overall housing target for Key Settlements for Growth in Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy
- Mod18 – changes to Policy 3: The Green Belt

- In addition, in-combination effects on the changes to the sites and settlements (Mod7 to Mod16)

2.13 The SA team undertook a Sustainability Appraisal in February 2014 in order to assess the effect of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies. The appraisals are entirely consistent with the methodology used in previous appraisals and a copy of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework is attached as Appendix 1.

2.14 The full details of the appraisals on the proposed Main Modifications can be found in Appendix 2. The relevant appraisals from the previous Sustainability Appraisal addendums are also included in Appendix 2 to avoid any 'paper-chasing'. Any proposed changes to policy that did not result in substantive changes and required no further appraisal can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version (June 2012).

2.15 The full findings of the assessment are presented in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Screening Exercise

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod1	<u>Main Modification 1 – Insertion of Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</u> Add new policy	No	No	This new policy has already been previously appraised for the SA Addendum (CD/REG/09). The new policy was appraised as being likely to result in a positive impact on all of the SA objectives, aside from the crime objective where any impact was considered negligible. The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.
Mod2	<u>Main Modification 2 – Changes to Policy 1: Climate Change</u> Amend policy wording and justification text	Yes	Yes	Some of the changes to Policy 1 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09). Subsequent changes since CD/REG/09 affect policy wording and justification text which requires further appraisal.
Mod3	<u>Main Modification 3 – Changes to the Delivery Table in Policy 2</u> Amend policy wording (and update housing figures), add and amend justification text in Policy 2	Yes	Yes	Insertion of new justification paragraphs 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b clarify the policy impacts of the tranced trajectory and therefore require appraisal against a flat (annualised) trajectory.
Mod4	<u>Main Modification 4 – Changes to Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Main Built Up Area</u> Amend policy wording (and update housing figures) in Policy 2	Yes	Yes	This relates to the changes to the housing distribution between the main built up area and Key Settlements for Growth. The number of new homes in the main built up area has not been previously appraised and the proposed changes to the housing distribution between the main built up area and Key Settlements for Growth would require appraisal.
Mod5	<u>Main Modification 5 – Changes to Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Key Settlements for Growth</u> Amend policy wording (and update housing figures) in Policy 2	Yes	Yes	This relates to the changes to the housing distribution between the main built up area and Key Settlements for Growth. The number of new homes in the Key Settlements for Growth has not been previously appraised and the proposed changes to the housing distribution between the main built up area and Key Settlements for Growth would require appraisal.

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod6	<u>Main Modification 6 – Changes to Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy (matters not covered by Mod3, Mod4 and Mod5)</u> Amend policy wording, footnote and justification text	No	No	This relates to changes where they are not addressed in other modifications (i.e. Mod3 to Mod5 and Mod7 to Mod16). The changes relate to clarification of text and new transport schemes not driven by Aligned Core Strategies which do not result in substantive changes and require no further appraisal.
Mod7	<u>Main Modification 7 – Site Specific Changes to Strategic Location at Boots/Severn Trent</u> Amend policy wording and footnote in Policy 2 Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	The changes only relate to policy wording (i.e. the 'up to' figure) and footnote which do not result in substantive changes and require no further appraisal. Extract of the appraisal from the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version stage is included in Appendix 2.
Mod8	<u>Main Modification 8 – Site Specific – Consequences of Strategic Location for Growth in the Vicinity of the proposed HS2 station at Toton for minimum of 500 homes</u> Add new strategic location for growth, add and amend policy wording, add and amend justification text in Policy 2 Add justification text in Policy 3 Amend policy wording and add justification text in Policy 4 Amend policy wording in Policy 15 and add justification text in Policy 15 Add justification text in Policy 16 Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for the SA Addendum on Proposed Broxtowe Modifications (CD/EX/38). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.
Mod9	<u>Main Modification 9 – Site Specific – New Strategic Allocation at Teal Close, Netherfield for 830 homes</u> Amend spatial objective Add new strategic allocation, add and amend policy wording, add and amend justification text in Policy 2 Amend policy wording in Policy 4 Add justification text in Policy 16 Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for Gedling's work on different scenarios (CD/EX/36). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod10	<u>Main Modification 10 – Site Specific – Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be identified as a Strategic Location for at least 600 homes</u> Amend spatial objectives Amend policy wording and justification text in Policy 2 Amend policy wording in Policy 4, Policy 6 and Policy 7 Update Appendix A and Appendix B	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for Gedling's work on different scenarios (CD/EX/36). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.
Mod11	<u>Main Modification 11 – Site Specific Changes to North of Papplewick Lane (reduction of homes to 300)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for Gedling's work on different scenarios (CD/EX/36). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.
Mod12	<u>Main Modification 12 – Site Specific Changes to Brinsley (reduction of homes to 150)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	The changes only relate to the reduction of the homes. Extract of the appraisal from the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version stage is included in Appendix 2.
Mod13	<u>Main Modification 13 – Site Specific Changes to Eastwood (reduction of homes to 1,250)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	The changes only relate to the reduction of the homes. Extract of the appraisal from the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version stage is included in Appendix 2.
Mod14	<u>Main Modification 14 – Site Specific Changes to Bestwood Village (reduction of homes to 260)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for Gedling's work on different scenarios (CD/EX/36). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.
Mod15	<u>Main Modification 15 – Site Specific Changes to Calverton (reduction of homes to 1055)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for Gedling's work on different scenarios (CD/EX/36). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.
Mod16	<u>Main Modification 16 – Site Specific Changes to Ravenshead (reduction of homes to 330)</u> Amend policy wording (i.e. update housing figure) Update Appendix A	Yes in combination	No	This site has already been previously appraised for Gedling's work on different scenarios (CD/EX/36). The appraisal is included in Appendix 2.

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod17	<u>Main Modification 17 – Review of Plan (new Policy 2.8 and new Section 20)</u> Amend policy wording in Policy 2. Add new section (Key Monitoring Indicators)	No	No	This new addition relates to administrative action and includes a list of monitoring indicators which does not reflect a policy approach. It would be impossible to come to any conclusions that monitoring will have in terms of the SA objectives. Therefore no appraisal is required.
Mod18	<u>Main Modification 18 – Changes to Policy 3: The Green Belt</u> Amend policy wording and justification text	Yes	Yes	Changes to Policy 3 which require re-appraisal.
Mod19	<u>Main Modification 19 – Changes to Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development</u> Amend policy wording (and update employment figures), justification text and monitoring arrangements	No	No	Changes to Policy 4 which do not result in substantive changes and require no further appraisal.
Mod20	<u>Main Modification 20 – Changes to Policy 5: Nottingham City Centre</u> Amend policy wording and justification text	No	No	Changes to Policy 5 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal. Although the level of capacity in the city centre has been reduced this does not result in substantial change to Policy 5 and does not therefore required to be re-appraised. Subsequent changes since CD/REG/09 only affect justification text which requires no further appraisal.
Mod21	<u>Main Modification 21 – Changes to Policy 6: Role of Town and Local Centres</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 6 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to the minor changes to policy and justification text. Subsequent changes since CD/REG/09 only affect wording “subsequent Development Plan Documents” which have been amended to “part 2 Local Plans” which requires no further appraisal.
Mod22	<u>Main Modification 22 – Changes to Policy 7: Regeneration</u> Amend justification text	No	No	Only changes to justification text wording and require no further appraisal.

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod23	<p><u>Main Modification 23 – Changes to Policy 8: Housing Size, Mix and Choice</u> Amend policy wording and justification text</p>	No	No	<p>Changes to Policy 8 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to an increased affordable housing requirements across the conurbation and not resulted in a change to the policy. Two alternative approaches could be put forward to meet this increased requirement of: 1) allocate more housing or 2) increase the percentage of affordable housing requirements. Scenario 1 has already been assessed at workshop 3 and is shown to be not as sustainable as the preferred approach. The other option, of increasing affordable housing requirement, is not viable and, as such, is not a reasonable alternative. The Greater Nottingham Housing Market & Economic Prospects report (2012) (CD/KEY/02) has also shown that increasing the amount of land available for housing is also not a viable alternative. In any event, planning obligations are not the only way to provide affordable housing and so increased need could be addressed through other local or central government policies/programmes. Policy 8 is broader in that Homes in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) are now included, however this is not considered to be a substantive change to require re-appraisal as the HMOs are mainly occupied by students or are within areas where there are high concentrations of students. Subsequent changes since CD/REG/09 only affect justification text and require no further appraisal.</p>

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod24	<u>Main Modification 24 – Changes to Policy 9: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 9 remove duplication of guidance contained with the National Planning Policy Framework and do not result in substantive changes or require further appraisal.
Mod25	<u>Main Modification 25 – Changes to Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 10 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to minor change to policy on land instability and contamination. Not substantive enough change to policy to warrant reassessment.
Mod26	<u>Main Modification 26 – Changes to Policy 11: The Historic Environment</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 11 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to minor change to policy text and justification. Subsequent change since CD/REG/09 only very minor change to policy wording (Policy 11.1) and require no further appraisal.
Mod27	<u>Main Modification 27 – Changes to Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 12 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to minor change to policy text and justification.
Mod28	<u>Main Modification 28 – Changes to Policy 13: Culture, Tourism and Sport</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 13 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to minor change to policy text and justification. Subsequent change since CD/REG/09 only very minor change to policy wording (Policy 13.1b) which requires no further appraisal.

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod29	<u>Main Modification 29 – Changes to Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand</u> Amend policy wording and justification text	No	No	Changes to Policy 14 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal. A positive change to policy 14.3d) but not considered substantive enough to require reassessment of the policy. Other change only affecting policy/justification text wording clarification.
Mod30	<u>Main Modification 30 – Changes to Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 15 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal. Subsequent changes since CD/REG/09 only affect wording “subsequent Development Plan Documents” which have been amended to “part 2 Local Plans” which requires no further appraisal. The new transport schemes not driven by the Aligned Core Strategies and do not need to be assessed.
Mod31	<u>Main Modification 31 – Changes to Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space</u> Amend policy wording and monitoring arrangements	No	No	Changes to Policy 16 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal due to minor change to policy text.
Mod32	<u>Main Modification 32 – Changes to Policy 17: Biodiversity</u> Amend policy wording and monitoring arrangements	No	No	Changes to Policy 17 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal. The changes provide more explanation on how the policy will be used. Subsequent change since CD/REG/09 only minor change to monitoring arrangements which requires no further appraisal.
Mod33	<u>Main Modification 33 – Changes to Policy 18: Infrastructure</u> Add justification text	No	No	Changes to Policy 18 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal. Mod33 relates to change to justification text and requires no further appraisal.

Ref	Proposed Main Modifications	Do changes to the policy significantly affect likely sustainability implications?	Further SA required	Comments
Mod34	<u>Main Modification 34 – Changes to Policy 19: Developer Contributions</u> Amend policy wording	No	No	Changes to Policy 19 have been identified in SA Addendum (CD/REG/09) which required no appraisal. Mod34 relates to very minor change to policy wording (Policy 19.3) which requires no further appraisal.
Mod35	<u>Main Modification 35 – Amendment to Appendix C (Trajectories) to reflect changes to Policy 2</u> Update housing trajectories	No	No	The in-combination effect of these is dealt with in Mod4and Mod5 in addition to Mod7 to Mod16.

2.16 The table below has been used for the previous appraisals and is used throughout this document for the sustainability appraisals that have been undertaken. In addition, the colour coding has been used to provide a visual summary of the overall results for each of the appraisals of the SA objectives.

Table 3: Key

+++	Very major/important positive
++	Moderate to major positive
+	Minor to moderate positive
+/-	Minor positive and minor negative
?	Unknown impact
	Negligible impact/not relevant
+/-	Minor positive and minor negative
-	Minor to moderate negative
--	Moderate to major negative
---	Very major/important negative

Appraising the revised Aligned Core Strategies Policies

2.17 Table 4(overleaf) summarises the sustainability impacts of the 20 policies in the light of the changes and proposed Main Modificationsto the Aligned Core Strategies. This table supersedes Table 21 of the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Versionreport (June 2012).

Table 4: Sustainability Appraisal of the Aligned Core Strategies Policies (see key on page17)

	1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructures	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and Flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure
A – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
1 – Climate Change		+	-				-	+		++		+		+
2 – The Spatial Strategy	++	+	-		+	-	-	-	-		+	+		
3 – The Green Belt	++		-		+						++	+		
4 – Employment Provision and Economic Development		+	+			-	-	-	-	-		+	+	++
5 – Nottingham City Centre	+	++	+	+	++	+	+	-	-	+	++	++	++	++
6 – The Role of Town and Local Centres	+	+			+						++	+	+	+
7 – Regeneration	++	+	+	+	+				-	+	+	+	+	+
8 – Housing Size, Mix and Choice	++	+			+	+					+		+	
9 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	++	++	+	+	+	+	+		+		+			
10 – Design and Enhancing Local Identity			++	++	+		+			+	+			
11 – The Historic Environment		+	++		+	++	++	+				+		
12 – Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles		++		+	++	++				+	++	+		+
13 – Culture, Sport and Tourism		++	+	+	++						++	+	+	+
14 – Managing Travel Demand		+	+	+	+	+		+			++			
Policy 15 - Transport Infrastructure Priorities		+			+	-	-	-		-	+	++		++
16 – Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space	-	+	+		+	++	++	+			+			
17 – Biodiversity	-	++				++	++	+		+	+			
18 – Infrastructure		+			+			+	+	+	+	++		
19 – Developer Contributions	+	+			+	+	+	+			+		+	

Main Impacts of the Aligned Core Strategies Proposed Main Modifications on Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

2.18 The SEA Directive requires the consideration of the secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the local plan. These are defined as follows:

Secondary or indirect effects are effects that are not a direct result of the plan, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway. Examples of secondary effects are a development that changes a water table and thus affects the ecology of a nearby wetland; and construction of one project that facilitates or attracts other developments.

Cumulative effects arise, for instance, where several developments each have insignificant effects but together have a significant effect; or where several individual effects of the plan (e.g. noise, dust and visual) have a combined effect.

Synergistic effects interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects. Synergistic effects often happen as habitats, resources or human communities get close to capacity. For instance a wildlife habitat can become progressively fragmented with limited effects on a particular species until the last fragmentation makes the area too small to support the species at all.

(from 'A Practical Guide to Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive' (2006))

2.19 Table 4 (on page 18) summarises the main impacts of various components of the Aligned Core Strategies in the light of the proposed Main Modifications. The main findings are:

SA Objective 1: Housing = mostly positive with some negative effects

2.20 The objective seeks to ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the plan areas. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective because the proposed Main Modifications to Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy relate to the re-distribution of housing.

SA Objective 2: Health = significant positive effects

2.21 The objective aims to improve health and reduce health inequalities. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective.

SA Objective 3: Heritage = mostly positive with some negative effects

2.22 The objective promotes the provision of better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the heritage of the area. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective.

SA Objective 4: Crime = positive

2.23 The objective seeks to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective.

SA Objective 5: Social = significant positives

2.24 The objective relates to the promotion and support of the development and growth of social capital across the plan areas. The proposed Main Modification 23 (changes to Policy 8) states that residential development should be sustainable, inclusive and mixed. Houses in Multiple Occupation are now included as part of homes developments which will aid social capital in Nottingham City.

SA Objective 6: Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure = mostly positive with some negative effects

2.25 The objective aims to increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green Infrastructure across the plan areas. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective. However there will be some increase in detailed Green Infrastructure proposals such as the Green Infrastructure at the Toton strategic location for growth and public open space and ecology park at the Teal Close site. The proposed Main Modification 31 (changes to Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space) increases biodiversity monitoring and the scale at which Green Infrastructure will be delivered.

SA Objective 7: Landscape = mostly positive with some negative effects

2.26 The objective is concerned with the protection and enhancement of the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of the plan area, including heritage assets and their settings. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective.

SA Objective 8: Natural Resources and Flooding = mostly positive with some negative effects

2.27 The objective seeks to prudently manage the natural resources of the area including water, air quality, soils and minerals whilst also minimising the risk of flooding. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective. However the proposed Main Modification 8 may have significant long term effects on this objective which are indeterminate because they are subject to the HS2 Phase Two proposal. The proposed Main Modification 25 (changes to Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity) adds ground conditions of the site as a criterion for design excellence.

SA Objective 9: Waste = mostly negative with some positive effects

2.28 The objective seeks to minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective.

SA Objective 10: Energy and Climate Change = mostly positive with some negative effects

2.29 The objective seeks to minimise energy usage and to develop the areas renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective. The proposed Main Modification 2 (changes to Policy 1: Climate Change) enhances the Aligned Core Strategies with respect to this objective.

SA Objective 11: Transport = significant positive effects

2.30 The objective seeks to make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available. The proposed Main Modifications to Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy will increase positive effects in transferring new housing development to the more sustainable main built up area, including reducing non-public transport travel. The proposed Main Modification 29 (changes to Policy 14: Managing Travel Demand) enhances the plan's contribution to this objective and the proposed Main Modification 30 (changes to Policy 15: Transport Infrastructure Priorities) has transport schemes which will potentially contribute to this objective.

SA Objective 12: Employment = positive effects

2.31 The objective focuses on the creation of high quality employment opportunities. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective. The proposed Main Modification 19 (changes to Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development) improves the monitoring towards this objective.

SA Objective 13: Innovation = positive effects

2.32 The objective seeks to develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective. The proposed Main Modification 19 (changes to Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development) will monitor this objective.

SA Objective 14: Economic Structure = positive effects

2.33 The objective seeks to provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies. The proposed Main Modifications have no significant effects on the objective. The proposed Main Modification 19 (changes to Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development) will monitor this objective.

Overall Outcomes

- 2.34 The overall outcomes remain the same as reported in the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version report (June 2012) where paragraph 15.18 states that the overall positive outcomes are anticipated for all objectives, apart from Waste, where a small potential impact has been identified. Particularly strong positive impacts are predicted in respect of the Health, Social and Transport objectives, with significant overall positive impact also suggested for the Housing, Heritage, Landscape and Employment objectives. The small cumulative impact predicted against the waste objective is perhaps unsurprising, given the overall scale of development proposed within the plan. However, it is considered that sufficient mitigation could be provided through implementation of Waste Local Plan policies applicable across the area.
- 2.35 Annex I of the SEA Directive requires the report to provide information on 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”. These issues are covered in the SA objectives (which is attached as Appendix 1). Table 5 summarises the likely significant effects on the SA objectives in line with the requirements of the SEA Directive. This table supersedes Table 23 of the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version report (June 2012).

Table 5: Likely Significant Effects of the Main Modifications

Short/Medium/Long Term (S/M/L); Permanent/Temporary (P/T); Secondary (Sec); Cumulative and Synergistic (Cum/Syn)					
Positive/negative (+/-) None (x); Yes (✓)					
SA objective (SEA issue(s))	S/M/L	P/T	Sec	Cum/Syn	Comment
1. Housing (material assets)	L	P	✓	✓	In long term, the policies will ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the plan areas. The level of future population in the plan areas will be determined by the level of housing provision. The development may create secondary effects from the use of material assets from outside the area and this would be a matter for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.
2. Health (population and human health)	L	P	✓	✓	Policy 12: Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles includes health and the issue is dealt with spatially across other policies. Long term permanent human health benefits are dependent on delivery of the plan, especially local facilities. As plan implementation progresses, its effects on health and health inequalities will become more significant and lead to a permanent change in the area. The cumulative effects of housing and economic developments will have significant impact.
3. Heritage (cultural heritage)	L	P	✓	✓	Policy 11: The Historic Environment includes heritage and the issue is dealt with spatially across other policies. The introduction of renewable energy technologies resulting from implementation of the climate change policy was identified as possibly having a negative impact on the heritage objective. Developments may change the cultural heritage of an area and synergistically there is a capacity beyond which the character of an area may no longer be special.
4. Crime (population and human health)	L	P	✓	✓	In long term, the policies will serve to locate development in areas that are accessible and to ensure that new developments are laid out and designed in such a way that crime and antisocial behaviour are discouraged.
5. Social (population and human health)	L	P	✓	✓	In long term, the policies will provide a cumulatively positive effect. As plan implementation progresses, its effects on cultural assets will become more significant and lead to a permanent change in the area. The cumulative effects of housing and economic developments will have significant impact on population.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure (biodiversity, fauna and flora)	L	P	x	✓	In long term, there is positive impact to increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green Infrastructure. Growth through residential, employment and economic development and transport infrastructure will have a cumulatively negative impact that would have to be mitigated. Ecological assessments will have to be carried out to ensure that protected species are not put at risk.
7. Landscape (landscape)	L	P	✓	✓	Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space includes landscape and the issue is dealt with spatially in other policies. In long term, the policies of the plan will protect and enhance the landscape character of the plan area.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding (water, climatic factors and material assets)	L	P	✓	✓	New development will inevitably have a negative impact on natural resources including water. The significant level of residential and employment development and the associated transport infrastructure could produce a cumulative impact against the SA objective that will have to be mitigated.

Short/Medium/Long Term (S/M/L); Permanent/Temporary (P/T); Secondary (Sec); Cumulative and Synergistic (Cum/Syn)					
Positive/negative (+/-) None (x); Yes (✓)					
SA objective (SEA issue(s))	S/M/L	P/T	Sec	Cum/Syn	Comment
9. Waste (soil and material assets)	S/M/L	P	✓	✓	The significant level of residential and employment/regeneration development is likely to produce a cumulative negative impact that will have to be mitigated. Loss of greenfield sites will lead to the inevitable loss of soils. Prioritisation of brownfield development will protect against loss of valuable soils.
10. Energy and Climate Change (climatic factors)	L	P	✓	✓	Policy1: Climate Change and other policies are designed to mitigate against the impacts of climate change. The policies promoting renewable energy, sustainable development and transport will provide a cumulative positive contribution towards the SA objective. Potential effects could extend beyond the boundaries of the Aligned Core Strategies.
11. Transport (air and climatic factors)	S/M/L	P	✓	✓	Although the plan aims to promote development in accessible locations and enhance the availability of sustainable modes of transport, it is anticipated that underlying trends will result in increased traffic generation, potentially resulting in reduced air quality. Potential effects on air quality are likely to be localised, especially in relation to existing or potential Air Quality Management Areas.
12. Employment (material assets)	L	P	✓	✓	In long term, the plan will create high quality employment opportunities. The growth in employment and economic development will impact on material assets.
13. Innovation (population)	L	P	x	✓	In long term the plan will develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation by creating jobs and encouraging people to live and work in the plan areas. The level of future population in the plan areas will be determined by the level of job opportunities.
14. Economic Structure (material assets)	L	P	✓	✓	The growth in employment and economic development will impact on material assets. In long term, there is a positive cumulative outcome to provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies.

Conclusions

2.36 The Sustainability Appraisal process has appraised the social, environmental and economic effects of the Aligned Core Strategies.

2.37 The findings of the further appraisals as a consequence of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version set out in this document are summarised as follows:

- The proposed Main Modifications 2, 3, 4, 5 and 18 were scoped as having significant impacts on the SA objectives. All other proposed Main Modifications to the policies within the Aligned Core Strategies were 'scoped' out as not having any substantive impact on the SA objectives.
- The proposed Main Modification 2 (changes to Policy 1: Climate Change) was appraised as having a significant positive effect on the energy and climate change objective but no significant effects on other objectives.
- The proposed Main Modification 3 on the new justification paragraphs 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b in Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy was appraised with lesser negative overall effects likely on the environmental objectives for the tranced trajectory in comparison with the flat trajectory.
- The proposed Main Modification 4 on the overall housing target for the Main Built Up Area in Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy was appraised as having a major/important positive effect on the housing objective and a major positive effect on the transport objective. The proposed Main Modification 5 on the overall housing target for Key Settlements for Growth in Policy 2 will result in a reduced impact on the environmental objectives.
- The proposed Main Modification 18 (changes to Policy 3: Green Belt) was appraised with positive overall effects likely because this will ensure delivery of the housing objective with significant benefit to the transport objective by accommodating new development in sustainable locations.

2.38 It is considered that the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies, as appraised in this document do not materially alter the conclusions in the Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version report (June 2012).

3. Equality Impact Assessment

- 3.1 An Equality Impact Assessment is defined by the Equality & Human Rights Commission as “...a tool that helps public authorities make sure their policies, and the ways they carry out their functions, do what they are intended to do for everybody”¹. Undertaking Equality Impact Assessments allows local authorities to identify any potential discrimination caused by their policies or the way they work and take steps to make sure that it is removed. Equality Impact Assessments also allow for the identification of opportunities to promote equality.
- 3.2 The Equality Act 2010 (section 49) sets out the general equality duty for public bodies. Previously the equality duty had related to individual characteristics (such as race, gender and disability). The Equality Act 2010 combined and streamlined these at the same time as widening the range of protected characteristics and the definition of 'discrimination'. The Equality Duty requires that in exercising their functions 'due regard' is given to the need to:
- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act.
 - Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
 - Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.
- 3.3 'Due regard' means that a public body must give weight to the duties outlined above in proportion to its relevance when discharging their functions. As shown in recent case law² this must be done in a conscious way with focus on the specific requirements of the legislation. However, 'due regard' does not mean that a change needs to be made but that appropriate weight needs to be given. Other issues, such as viability or the need to deliver development for economic or regeneration purposes may outweigh the equality considerations. In these cases the reasons should be robust and transparent. It is clear that this Equality Impact Assessment and the changes that result from it will be an important part of the preparation and decision to adopt the Aligned Core Strategies as part of the development plan for the local authorities involved.
- 3.4 Equality Impact Assessments have been carried out as part of the preparation of the Aligned Core Strategies. This has been undertaken in three phases:
- Phase 1 – on the policies in the 'Option for Consultation';
 - Phase 2 – on the policies in the 'Publication Version'; and
 - Phase 3 – on the policies in the 'Submission Version'.

¹Equality & Human Rights Commission “Equality Impact Assessment Guidance” (Nov 2009) p.3

²R (on the application of Harris) v London Borough of Haringey (Equality and Human Rights Commission intervening) - [2010] All ER (D) 177 (Jun)

- 3.5 Following the public hearing sessions held by the Inspector a number of proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version are proposed. It is necessary to undertake a further phase of assessment to ensure there are no issues related to the protected characteristics.
- 3.6 The proposed Main Modifications include a number of changes which may have been considered through the Phase 3 Equality Impact Assessment. This further phase will provide an additional check on the impact of the changes making the process more robust. The approach to this phase will follow the approach adopted at each of the earlier phases of assessment and focus on the proposed Main Modifications proposed rather than individual changes.
- 3.7 Firstly, the proposed Main Modifications will be scoped for their relevance. The purpose of this stage is to identify the proposed Main Modifications which have the potential to impact, positively or negatively, on each of the protected characteristics.
- 3.8 For those Modifications which are considered to be relevant, an assessment of impact will be carried out. This will consider the key issues affected by spatial planning identified for each of the protected characteristics and the impact of the policy on these issues. This will be followed by an Action Plan which will set out suggested actions to improve the equality of the Aligned Core Strategies.
- 3.9 As noted above, there have been previous phases of Equality Impact Assessment. This means that a significant amount of work has been done to scope the relevance of policies and assess the impact of them. Rather than 'reinvent the wheel', this new phase has focused on the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies. As such this document should be read alongside the three previous reports to fully understand the issues and process.
- 3.10 The table below sets out the impact assessment of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version.

Modification	Summary of change	Scoping for Relevance	Impact Assessment
Mod1	Inclusion of a Policy on the 'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development'	Previously assessed as part of the submission process.	Not required.
Mod2	Changes reflecting consultation comments and discussions at the Hearing Sessions. Principally related to the assessment of development proposals and viability.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod3	Changes to the delivery table in Policy as a result of the changes to the distribution of development and availability of updated figures from SHLAA assessments.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required
Mod4	Changes to the amount of housing to be delivered in the main built up area reflecting inclusion of Teal Close and Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm sites and the reductions in the Key Settlements of Bestwood Village, Calverton and Ravenshead in Gedling, and the reductions in the Key Settlements of Brinsley and Eastwood in Broxtowe Borough.	Relevance to Age	<p>Reduction of housing in rural areas could impact on Age due to corresponding decrease in potential for the provision of elderly accommodation in villages such as Ravenshead.</p> <p>However, benefits of increased housing in main built up area (closer to services/employment) outweigh the harm.</p> <p>Continue with Policy</p>
Mod5	Changes to the amount of housing to be delivered in the Key Settlements of Bestwood Village, Calverton and Ravenshead reflecting inclusion of Teal Close and Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm sites in Gedling, and reductions in the Key Settlements of Brinsley and Eastwood in Broxtowe Borough.	Relevance to Age	<p>Reduction of housing in rural areas could impact on Age due to corresponding decrease in potential for the provision of elderly accommodation in villages such as Ravenshead.</p> <p>However, benefits of increased housing in main built up area (closer to services/employment) outweigh the harm.</p> <p>Continue with Policy</p>

Modification	Summary of change	Scoping for Relevance	Impact Assessment
Mod6	Changes to the Spatial Strategy not covered by Mod3, Mod4 or Mod5. These are mainly to clarify matters or provide a better explanation of the approach to be taken.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod7	Changes relate to updated information regarding the masterplanning of the site.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod8	Changes to include a strategic location for a minimum of 500 houses in the Toton area.	Relevance to Age and Race.	The age profile of the area could change as a result of potential for commuting and local employment, as Toton currently has below average working-age population. The area has a relatively higher percentage of White British people which could be exacerbated. Adjust the policy to remove the barriers or better promote equality by mitigation through masterplanning the homes mix and infrastructure.
Mod9	Changes required to include the new strategic allocation adjacent to the main built up area at Teal Close in Gedling. The site has been granted planning permission.	Relevance to Age.	Netherfield has a lower average age than other parts of the Borough. Delivery of employment land will increase the supply of jobs. As the site has planning permission further changes will be difficult to make. No change required
Mod10	Change to assign a housing figure of at least 600 homes at Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be delivered within the plan period.	The site has been included in the Aligned Core Strategies but with delivery expected outside the Plan Period. The Modifications proposed do not alter the relevance previously identified.	Not required.
Mod11	Reduction in the number of dwellings on North of Papplewick Lane site and its extent.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.

Modification	Summary of change	Scoping for Relevance	Impact Assessment
Mod12	Reduction in the number of dwellings allocated to Brinsley.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Numerical change insignificant and better matched to general need. No change
Mod13	Reduction in the number of dwellings allocated to Eastwood.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Numerical change insignificant and better matched to general need. No change
Mod14	Reduction in the number of dwellings allocated to Bestwood Village.	Relevance to Age.	Reduction of housing in rural areas could impact on Age due to corresponding decrease in potential for the provision of elderly accommodation. However reductions in the cumulative impact on Hucknall and benefits of increased growth in main built up area outweigh this. Continue with Policy
Mod15	Reduction in the number of dwellings allocated to Calverton.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod16	Reduction in the number of dwellings allocated to Ravenshead.	Relevance to Age.	Reduction of housing in rural areas could impact on Age due to corresponding decrease in potential for the provision of elderly accommodation. However the benefits of increased growth in main built up area outweigh this. Continue with Policy
Mod17	Inclusion of monitoring indicators to trigger a review of the Aligned Core Strategies	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod18	Inclusion of a new policy regarding the sequential approach and weight to be given to non-Green Belt sites.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.

Modification	Summary of change	Scoping for Relevance	Impact Assessment
Mod19	Changes reflecting consultation comments and discussions at the Hearing Sessions. These are mainly to better clarify matters or better explain the approach to be taken.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod20	Changes to include updated information resulting from a Retail Study and to better explain the intended approach.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod21	Changes to better explain the town centre first policy.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod22	Change to clarify number of risks to delivery of large/complex sites.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod23	Changes to better explain areas where housing balance may need consideration; inclusion of Houses in Multiple Occupation within this. Better explanation of policy for mixed communities.	Relevance to Age.	Inclusion of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) broadens scope of Policy beyond HMOs occupied by students with impacts particularly on younger people. The benefits of the change in terms of maintaining sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, combined with opportunities for HMO development in areas away from HMO concentrations outweigh any negative effects. Continue with Policy
Mod24	Removal of inclusion of sites in identified SUEs and changes to the criteria for the assessment of proposed sites.	Relevance to Race as policy relates to specific group with identified issues.	Reference to SUEs removed from Policy does not prevent location in these locations, if deemed appropriate in part 2 Local Plans. The changes to criteria largely reduce duplication with other Policies, but may widen the choice of site. Continue with Policy
Mod25	Changes to better explain approach and include technical land stability issue.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod26	Minor changes to Policy text.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.

Modification	Summary of change	Scoping for Relevance	Impact Assessment
Mod27	Change to better explain approach.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod28	Change to better explain approach.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod29	Reference to support highway network provides to the economy and explanation of the role of the Strategic Road Network. Other changes to better explain approach.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod30	Updated list of transport schemes and explanation of source of future transport schemes.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod31	Change to better explain approach and improve monitoring arrangements.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod32	Changes to better explain approach and improve monitoring arrangements.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod33	Change to better explain approach.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod34	Change to better reflect regulation.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.
Mod35	Changes to update the housing trajectories to reflect other changes and updated information.	No relevance to protected characteristics identified.	Not required.

4. Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 4.1 The Habitats Regulations Assessment screening of the Aligned Core Strategies found that there could be potentially significant effects on parts of the prospective Sherwood Forest Special Protection Area. It concluded that a precautionary approach should be followed and that policy should not promote development that would attract higher numbers of visitors to the prospective Special Protection Area. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out requirements for a range of mitigation measures as recommended in the Habitats Assessment Screening Record.

- 4.2 It is considered that no additional effects will arise and impact on the prospective Special Protection Area as a result of the proposed Main Modifications to the Aligned Core Strategies Publication Version and the distribution of housing in the Aligned Core Strategies and in particular the housing proposed in the Hucknall area and the two key settlements of Calverton and Ravenshead. It is viewed that the detailed mitigation measures which have been included for both Calverton and Ravenshead remain appropriate and fit for purpose. The submission version of the Aligned Core Strategies included a significantly larger housing requirement for Calverton and it is considered that a lowering of the housing numbers in that area will only reduce any potential impact.

Appendix 1: Refined Sustainability Appraisal Framework

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators
1. Housing To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of the plan areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups? • Will it reduce homelessness? • Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? 	Affordable housing House prices; housing affordability Homelessness Housing completions (type and size) Housing tenure LA stock declared non decent Sheltered accommodation Vacant dwellings by tenure
2. Health To improve health and reduce health inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce health inequalities? • Will it improve access to health services? • Will it increase the opportunities for recreational physical activity? 	Adults taking part in sport Health inequalities Life expectancy at birth New/enhanced health facilities People killed/seriously injured in road accidents Teenage conception rates
3. Heritage To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy the plan areas heritage including the preservation, enhancement and promotion of the cultural and built environment (including archaeological assets).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect historic sites • Will it help people to increase their participation in cultural heritage activities? • Will it protect/improve access to historic sites? • Will it protect and enhance the historical, geological and archaeological environment? 	Open spaced managed to green flag award standard New and enhanced open space Satisfaction with open space Museums
4. Crime To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime in the plan areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime? • Will it increase the prevalence of diversionary activities? • Will it contribute to a safe secure built environment through designing out crime? 	Crimes – by category and total Fear of crime Noise complaints
5. Social To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across the plan areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets? • Will it improve access to, encourage engagement with and residents satisfaction in community activities? • Will it improve ethnic and intergenerational relations? 	Community centres Gains/losses of community facilities Leisure centres Libraries/mobile library stops Participation involuntary and community activities A place where people from different backgrounds get on well together Satisfaction with leisure facilities

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators
<p>6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</p> <p>To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green Infrastructure and the natural environment across the plan areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it help protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species? • Will it help protect and improve habitats? • Will it increase, maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? • Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management? • Will it provide new open space? • Will it improve the quality of existing open space? • Will it encourage and protect Green Infrastructure opportunities? 	<p>Local/National nature reserves Local wildlife sites (Biological SINCS) SSSIs</p>
<p>7. Landscape</p> <p>To protect and enhance the landscape character of the plan areas, including heritage and its setting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it respect identified landscape character? 	<p>Ancient woodland Conservation Areas Historic Parks and Gardens Listed Buildings/Buildings at risk/locally listed buildings Scheduled ancient monuments Woodland areas/new woodland</p>
<p>8. Natural Resources and Flooding</p> <p>To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including water, air quality, soils and minerals whilst also minimising the risk of flooding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve water quality? • Will it improve air quality? • Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials? • Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques? • Will it minimise Flood Risk? • Will it prevent the loss of high quality soils to development? 	<p>Greenfield land lost Carbon dioxide emissions Contaminated land Flood risk Households in Air Quality Management Areas Number of days moderate/high air pollution Employment and housing developed on PDL Density of dwellings Developments incorporating SUDS Planning applications granted contrary to advice of EA Biological/chemistry levels in rivers, canals and freshwater bodies Production of primary and secondary/recycled aggregates</p>
<p>9. Waste</p> <p>To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce household and commercial waste per head? • Will it increase waste recovery and recycling per head? • Will it reduce hazardous waste? • Will it reduce waste in the construction industry? 	<p>Controlled waste produced Capacity of new waste management facilities by alternative to landfill Household waste arisings composted, land filled, recycled, used to recover energy</p>

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators
<p>10. Energy and Climate Change</p> <p>To minimise energy usage and to develop the area's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings? • Will it support the generation and use of renewable energy? • Will it support the development of community energy systems? • Will it support the development of community energy systems? • Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate 	<p>Energy use – renewables and petroleum products</p> <p>Energy use (gas/electricity) by end user</p> <p>Renewable energy capacity installed by type</p>
<p>11. Transport</p> <p>To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure? • Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment? • Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport? • Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities? 	<p>Accessibility to education sites, employment sites, health care, leisure centres, open space, shopping centres</p> <p>Change in road traffic mileage</p> <p>Development of transport infrastructure that assists car use reduction</p> <p>Levels of bus and light rail patronage</p> <p>New major non-residential development with travel plans</p> <p>People using car and non-car modes of travel to work</p> <p>Railway station usage</p> <p>Road traffic levels</p>
<p>12. Employment</p> <p>To create high quality employment opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs? • Will it reduce unemployment? • Will it increase average income levels? 	<p>Average annual income</p> <p>Benefit claimants</p> <p>VAT business registration rate, registrations, deregistrations</p> <p>Businesses per 1000 population</p> <p>Employment rate</p> <p>Jobs</p> <p>New floor space</p> <p>Shops, vacant shops</p> <p>Unemployment rate</p>
<p>13. Innovation</p> <p>To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase levels of qualification? • Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors? • Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the plan areas? 	<p>15 year olds achieving 5 or more GCSEs at Grade A* - C</p> <p>19 year olds qualified to NVQ level 2 or equivalent</p> <p>21 year olds qualified to NVQ level 3 or equivalent</p> <p>Working age population qualifications</p>
<p>14. Economic Structure</p> <p>To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses? • Will it improve the diversity of jobs available? • Will it provide the required infrastructure? • Will it provide business/university clusters 	<p>Completed business development floorspace</p> <p>Land developed for employment</p> <p>Employment land lost</p> <p>Employment land allocated</p> <p>Profile of employment by sector</p>

SA Objectives	Mod1 –Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	The policy is positive towards housing growth. Emphasises the need for negotiation and positive outcomes. Could result in increased approval rates. However, policy makes it clear that social and environment considerations still need to be taken into account. Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy gives direction to housing growth	
2. Health	Policy does not explicitly promote health, but does outline that development must improve social and environmental conditions within the area	
3. Heritage	The policy does not explicitly harm or improve heritage. The effects of the policy will be on a site by site basis. Any proposals having an impact on heritage assets will need to take into account the social, economic and environmental impacts. Reference to Policy 11: The Historic Environment will need to be taken into account.	
4. Crime	Negligible impact on crime although social implications will need to be considered. Reference to Policy 10: Design and Enhancing Local Identity will need to be taken into account.	
5. Social	Policy includes the requirement to consider the social aspects of sustainability and should therefore promote the overall social objective when determining applications	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	The policy is supportive of economic development, but not at any costs as environmental and social aspects also have to be taken into account. Reference to Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space and Policy 17: Biodiversity will need to be taken into account.	
7. Landscape	The policy is supportive of economic development, but not at any costs as environmental and social aspects also have to be taken into account. Reference to Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space and Policy 17: Biodiversity will need to be taken into account.	
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	The policy is supportive of economic development, but not at any costs as environmental and social aspects also have to be taken into account. Reference to Policy 1: Climate Change, Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space and Policy 17: Biodiversity will need to be taken into account.	
9. Waste	The policy promotes sustainable development and should therefore result in minimising waste. Reference to Policy 1: Climate Change will need to be taken into account as well which specifically requires waste to be minimised.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	The policy promotes sustainable development and should therefore result in minimising energy usage and sustainable design in new build or refurbishment of existing housing. Reference to Policy 1: Climate Change will need to be taken into account as well which specifically requires waste to be minimised.	

SA Objectives	Mod1 –Policy A: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Ideas for mitigation
11. Transport	The policy promotes sustainable development and should therefore result in development being located in sustainable locations, reducing the need to travel by private car and encouraging other more sustainable forms of transport. Policies 14 and 15 also need to be considered.	
12. Employment	The policy is positive towards economic growth. Emphasises the need for negotiation and positive outcomes. Could result in increased approval rates. However, policy makes it clear that social and environment considerations still need to be taken into account. Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development gives direction to economic growth in general, although reference to Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy, Policy 5: Nottingham City Centre and Policy 6: Role of Town and Local Centres will also need to be taken into account.	
13. Innovation	The policy is positive towards economic growth. Emphasises the need for negotiation and positive outcomes. Could result in increased approval rates. However, policy makes it clear that social and environment considerations still need to be taken into account. The policy does not specifically promote innovation, but the support for employment generally should create the positive conditions to assist this objective. Reference to other policies within the plan will be required, including Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy, Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development, Policy 5: Nottingham City Centre and Policy 6: Role of Town and Local Centres.	
14. Economic Structure	The policy is positive towards economic growth. Emphasises the need for negotiation and positive outcomes. Could result in increased approval rates. However, policy makes it clear that social and environment considerations still need to be taken into account. Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development gives direction to economic growth in general, although reference to Policy 2: The Spatial Strategy, Policy 5: Nottingham City Centre and Policy 6: Role of Town and Local Centres will also need to be taken into account.	

SA Objectives	Mod2 –Policy 1: Climate Change	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Modification to Policy 1: Climate Change potentially reduces cost on build as high sustainability no longer required and viability a criteria in considering climate change adaption for housing.	
2. Health	More efficient homes, cheaper to run. But if policy makes new homes less affordable then only people who can afford new homes can benefit from the positive impacts.	
3. Heritage	Impact of solar panels on Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas.	Protect those more sensitive areas.
4. Crime	Neutral impact.	
5. Social	Negligible impact.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Negligible impact.	
7. Landscape	Slight impact, as above for heritage objective. E.g. solar panels or wind turbines.	Ensure developments fit into landscape.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Use of suitable materials and design. Reduction in consumption of fossil fuels. Reduction in requirement reduces benefits of policy.	Alternative policies in Part 2 Local Plans.
9. Waste	Negligible impact.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	Emissions from homes contribute significantly to climate change. Making buildings more efficient would positively contribute to reducing impacts of climate change. Use of renewables would reduce reliance on fossil fuels.	
11. Transport	No relationship.	
12. Employment	Increase employment in low carbon sector, but may be loss of jobs in traditional energy sector.	
13. Innovation	Neutral impact.	
14. Economic Structure	Greener credentials for new employment premises if Merton-style rule is adhered to.	

Appraisal Mod3 – Justification paragraphs 3.2.8a and 3.2.8b (tranced trajectory)

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod3 – Tranched trajectory	Mod3 – Flat trajectory
1. Housing	It is acknowledged that a tranched trajectory would result in slower delivery for the reasons given justification text, but over the plan period the objectively assessed housing needs will be met.	Not withstanding market issues as set out in Greater Nottingham Housing Market & Economic Prospects report (2012), a flat trajectory could result in housing needs being met earlier in the plan period. Due to this, the housing objective is scored marginally higher.
2. Health	This trajectory has already planned for the necessary additional health care facilities.	Earlier housing delivery could result in short term pressures on existing health facilities as non-strategic sites will be required.
3. Heritage	It is acknowledged that there may be some negative impact on heritage assets, although for site allocations and locations within the Aligned Core Strategies these have been given consideration.	There may be more unknown impacts on heritage for a flat trajectory but it is difficult to quantify without site specific details.
4. Crime	It is considered that there is no difference between the different trajectories	
5. Social	The proposed sites have planned for enhanced social facilities.	There is the potential for insufficient social facilities being built.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Although there will be negative effects of development on this SA objective these have been planned for and mitigation measure put in place.	This is likely to result in greater harm to the natural environment due to unnecessary additional release of sites early in the plan period.
7. Landscape	Although there will be negative effects of development on this SA objective these have been planned for and mitigation measure put in place.	This is likely to result in greater harm to the character and beauty of the countryside and other land of higher environment value due to unnecessary additional release of sites early in the plan period.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Although there will be negative effects of development on this SA objective these have been planned for and mitigation measure put in place.	This could fail to encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings by unnecessary additional release of sites early in the plan period and thus reducing conversions and use of brownfield sites.
9. Waste	Although there will be negative effects of development on this SA objective these have been planned for and mitigation measure put in place.	Sites in less sustainable locations could result in increased pressures on waste management.
10. Energy and Climate Change	Although there will be negative effects of development on this SA objective these have been planned for and mitigation measure put in place. Future knowledge will continually reduce development impact over time.	Bringing forward development earlier may result in construction to lower environmental standards due to the timing of the introduction of changes in Building Regulations.

SA Objectives	Mod3 – Tranched trajectory	Mod3 – Flat trajectory
11. Transport	Although there will be negative effects of development on this SA objective these have been planned for and mitigation measures put in place.	This trajectory could result in failure to manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. For example favouring edge of urban sites over sites less accessible to a choice of transport modes.
12. Employment	It is considered that there is no difference between the different trajectories	
13. Innovation	It is considered that there is no difference between the different trajectories	
14. Economic Structure	It is considered that there is no difference between the different trajectories	

SA Objectives	Mod4 –Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Main Built Up Area	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	More houses in or adjoining the main built up area.	
2. Health	There are existing facilities in the main built up areathat can be enhanced and potential for provision of new facilities.	Planning contributions for health.
3. Heritage	Depends upon location of homes relative to heritage assets.	Implement Policy 11.
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards.No difference between main built up area/non-urbanarea.	
5. Social	New development in the main built up area would have access to social facilities.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Depends upon location of homes.	Implement environmental policies.
7. Landscape	Depends upon location of homes – not all sites will be brownfield. Marginal addition to urban landscape.	
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Depends upon location of homes. Marginal addition to urban environment resource implications not dissimilar to non-urban implications.	
9. Waste	No difference between main built up area/non-urbanarea.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	New houses would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings due to need to accord with current Building Regulations.No difference between main built up area/non-urbanarea.	
11. Transport	Sites of new homes would be in or adjoining the main built up area which will have good transport accessibility.	Implement IDP.
12. Employment	Depends upon size of sites. Economy development tends to concentrate in the main built up area.	Economic development strategy.
13. Innovation	Unknown.	
14. Economic Structure	Depends upon size of sites.Economy development tends to concentrate in the main built up area.	Economic development strategy.

SA Objectives	Mod5 –Policy 2 Overall Housing Target for the Key Settlements for Growth	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Less housing within the Key Settlements for Growth due to reduction of new homes at Brinsley and Eastwood (in Broxtowe) and Bestwood Village, Calverton and Ravenshead (in Gedling).	Monitor local housing needs
2. Health	Reduction of new homes would reduce pressure on local services but some potential for planning contributions. Fewer services than in the main built up area.	Implement IDP
3. Heritage	Depends upon location of homes relative to heritage assets	Implement Policy 11
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards. No difference between main built up area/non-urban area.	
5. Social	Any development in the village likely to encourage integration with existing community facilities. However reduced potential for social facilities	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Reduction of new homes would reduce the effects on environmental issues but still more sensitive to change.	Implement environmental policies
7. Landscape	Reduction of new homes would reduce the effects on landscape but still more sensitive to change.	Use LCA for projects.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Reduction of new homes would reduce the effects on natural resources and flooding but still more sensitive to change.	Implement Policies 1 and A.
9. Waste	Size of development would influence impact on household waste. However reduction of new homes would reduce the capacity for waste production in key settlements for growth.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	New houses would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings due to need to accord with current Building Regulations. No difference between main built up area/non-urban area.	
11. Transport	Reduced potential for 'unsustainable' travel but still less accessible than the main built up area and less potential for enhancements.	Implement IDP.
12. Employment	No new employment proposed in the Key Settlements.	Monitor local employment.
13. Innovation	Unknown.	
14. Economic Structure	No new employment proposed in the Key Settlements.	Monitor local employment.

Appraisal Mod7 –Strategic Location at Boots/Severn Trent

Appraisal from Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version June 2012 Appendices (CD/REG/08)

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod7 –Strategic Location at Boots/Severn Trent	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Significant site for providing for housing need. The development would provide an element of affordable housing on site.	
2. Health	The site is probably not big enough to warrant a new health centre so would result in an increase in demand on existing services in the area. The development of the site would result in greater leisure access to river which would bring health benefits.	Access to river. S.106 contribution
3. Heritage	Grade 1 listed buildings on site. Finding an alternative use of the listed buildings is difficult. The development provides investment and opportunities to preserve the listed buildings.	Possible site specific issues - Restoration issues to be addressed in SPD.
4. Crime	New development would provide new opportunities for crime. However, incorporation of designing out crime principles in the new layout could serve to make the area safer.	
5. Social	The site is well placed to the city to capture the potential of social capital opportunities.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Master planning of the area would enable the creation of new green corridors.	Protection of watercourses is important. Need to ensure integration of nature reserve to address concern about isolation of nature reserve and impact of increased leisure access on habitat.
7. Landscape	Subject to implementation of the development.	
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Presentation modified from Interim Report to display as neutral, to show balance between SA Framework criteria. The site is within an identified flood zone but flood defences being built; and this is counterbalanced by the lack of any Greenfield development	Flood protection measures required. Consideration of Supplementary Planning Document by local authorities
9. Waste	Neutral.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	New development brings with it the potential to incorporate sustainable features within design.	Needs reference to adaptation of buildings for future
11. Transport	Accessibility recently seen to be significantly improved because of potential enterprise zone funding for transport infrastructure and NET2 funding. EZ status and funding for tram and rail improvements. The sites have relatively weak existing accesses with the highway, and suffer from congestion. Public transport improvement measures, including direct bus access would improve access.	Prioritisation of Public Transport. Traffic impact assessment Smarter choices. Robust travel plan

SA Objectives	Mod7 –Strategic Location at Boots/Severn Trent	Ideas for mitigation
12. Employment	A gross loss of existing employment land is proposed but a net gain of employment would result, with high quality buildings provided.	
13. Innovation	Proposals for high quality employment land facilities. EZ status support now but uncertainty about delivery.	
14. Economic Structure	Proposals for high quality employment land facilities. EZ status support now but uncertainty about delivery.	

Appraisal Mod8 –Strategic Location for Growth in the Vicinity of the proposed HS2 station at Toton for minimum of 500 homes

Appraisal from Broxtowe’s Proposed Modifications (CD/EX/38)

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mo8 –Strategic Location for Growth in the Vicinity of the proposed HS2 station at Toton for minimum of 500 homes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Confirmed early delivery of 500 homes at Land in the vicinity of the proposed HS2 Hub Station. Associated affordable housing would be viable in this strong housing sub market. Overall the delivery may be affected by access, transport infrastructure to connect to the HS2 station.	Negotiation for affordable housing, at least of the policy minimum. Delivery of IDP.
2. Health	Larger area than rejected proposals gives greater potential for additional health facilities. General health benefits of new housing but expected delivery of homes as mentioned above.	Health related planning obligations.
3. Heritage	Broxtowe area without heritage assets; but Erewash Borough Council has stated in a letter dated 19th November 2013 which included a character appraisal of its Sandiacre Lock Conservation Area that there is a vulnerability of the Area to development in the Toton area. This is new evidence and thus the appraisal has been amended.	Sandiacre Lock Conservation Area Management Plan not yet adopted by EBC.
4. Crime	New possibilities for crime	Design out crime.
5. Social	Extends a relatively modern suburban area.	New cultural facilities.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure		
7. Landscape	Will affect a wildlife corridor.	Planned Green Infrastructure.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Larger area than previous proposals will have increased landscape impact in an area of strong character according to the LCA for Greater Nottingham, 2009, although its condition is moderate.	Woodland planting.
9. Waste	Land take greater than previous similar options.	
10. Energy and Climate Change		Use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).
11. Transport	No abnormal requirements.	
12. Employment	Larger site than other options in Broxtowe presents possibilities for renewable energy generation and energy saving technologies on site. Proximity of HS2 access provides opportunities for mitigation of climate change impact from alternative longer journey modes of transport in the long term.	Maximise energy and climate change gains from planning obligations.
13. Innovation	Integrate development with HS2 provision.	
14. Economic Structure	Area has potential adjacent access to all sustainable transport modes- HS2 in the long term, NET2, bus services, cycling and pedestrian facilities, and a Greenway route	Implement Policy 14

Appraisal Mod9 –New Strategic Allocation at Teal Close, Netherfield for 830 homes

Appraisal from Gedling Borough’s Sustainability Appraisal on the scenarios tested (CD/EX/36)

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod9 –New Strategic Allocation at Teal Close, Netherfield for 830 homes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	830 homes would be provided.	Link to policies requiring affordable housing.
2. Health	Contribution to local health care facilities would be required.	
3. Heritage	There are no heritage assets on site.	
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards.	
5. Social	Community services would be provided.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Development on site which is mainly farmland. The west side of the site is currently in use as sport pitches. Replacement sport pitch provision would be provided. There are two biological SINCs and a Local Nature Reserve to the south of the site. Public open space and ecology park would be provided adjoining the Local Nature Reserve (Netherfield Lagoons).	
7. Landscape	Visible open area from A612 road.	Landscape screening around the edges of the site could mitigate for impacts.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Entire site possibly affected by flooding. Development would be on greenfield site.	
9. Waste	Size of development would influence impact on household and commercial waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	The site has significant potential for renewable energy.	Link to climate change policy.
11. Transport	Site is on edge of built up area which has good transport links. Would not itself improve alternative modes of transport. Integrated transport/walking and cycling package would be required.	Would need to provide good bus links to the main built up area.
12. Employment	Loss of 10 ha of employment land. 7 ha of employment uses would be provided.	Link to employment policy.
13. Innovation	Unknown.	
14. Economic Structure	Loss of 10 ha of employment land. 7 ha of employment uses would be provided.	Link to employment policy.

Appraisal Mod10 –Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be identified as a Strategic Location for at least 600 homes

Appraisal from Gedling Borough’s Sustainability Appraisal on the scenarios tested (CD/EX/36)

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod10 –Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be identified as a Strategic Location for at least 600 homes	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	600 new homes would be provided.	Link to policies requiring affordable housing.
2. Health	New country park currently being implemented.	Local plan allocation and existing brief require health facility. Links needed between site and Country Park.
3. Heritage	Site would be built on top of a former colliery. There are no remnants of the colliery structure. Would affect part of Gedling House listed building.	
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards	
5. Social	Assumes provision of primary school and community facilities.	New primary school and community facility required.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Development would impact on local wildlife site, which would be lost as a result of the development. Opportunities to link to the Country Park but does not facilitate the Country Park. There are bats in the tunnel, and these might be disturbed as a result of more people and lights; but this could be mitigated.	Would ideally have some replacement of habitat, but there are limited opportunities for this on the development sites. Need to retain wooded strip (as much existing habitat as possible) through the middle of the site; existing brief covers protected species including bats. Existing balancing ponds should be maintained, and SUDS can be provided.
7. Landscape	There is a geological SINC on the site which would be unaffected under the current brief. 70% of the whole site is brownfield and remaining part is greenfield which would be affected.	Existing brief protects the geological SINC. Must link to policies on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Negative impacts on water quality and air quality. No flood risk issues on site, although the impact of building on the site could possibly increase flood risk in the area prone to flooding downstream. Part of the site is brownfield and part is greenfield. Development of new road would probably generate more traffic with consequential impacts on air quality.	Link to mineral railway line as is safeguarded in the brief and could possibly in the future lead to development of guided bus or similar.
9. Waste	Existing household waste recycling facility may be relocated to the employment element to the site.	

SA Objectives	Mod10 –Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm to be identified as a Strategic Location for at least 600 homes	Ideas for mitigation
10. Energy and Climate Change	The site has significant potential for renewable energy.	Existing brief mentions renewable energy.
11. Transport	A Gedling Access Road would be required and provide bypass to the village but would otherwise go against this SA objective of encouraging alternative modes of transport. The purpose of the Gedling Access Road is to benefit local area. The first 300 dwellings could be accommodated within the existing transport network without the need for the Gedling Access Road. An additional 300 dwellings could be constructed alongside the delivery of the Gedling Access Road during the plan period.	Link to mineral railway line is safeguarded in the existing brief and could possibly in the future lead to development of guided bus or similar.
12. Employment	Part of existing employment allocation would come forward within the plan period.	Link to employment policy.
13. Innovation	Unknown.	
14. Economic Structure	Part of existing employment allocation would come forward within the plan period.	Link to employment policy.

Appraisal Mod11 –North of Papplewick Lane (reduction of homes to 300)

Appraisal from Gedling Borough’s Sustainability Appraisal on the scenarios tested (CD/EX/36)

																Very major/important positive
																Major positive
																Moderate to major positive
																Moderate positive
																Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant		
																Minor negative
																Moderate negative
																Moderate to major negative
																Major negative
																Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod11 – North of Papplewick Lane (reduction of homes to 300)	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Reduced to 300 new homes.	Link to policies requiring affordable housing.
2. Health	Opportunities for physical activity due to proximity to River Leen. Not much access southwards along the River Leen, although there is access to the north to Moor Pond Wood. Also links to Linby Trail.	Need financial contribution to help support health facilities.
3. Heritage	Unknown.	
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards.	
5. Social	Section 106 agreement would ensure that new community facilities would need to be required or financial contributions where appropriate to serve the development. The new/upgraded facilities may also benefit existing residents.	Provision of new or upgraded community facilities through s106 agreements. Design layout of development to encourage integration with existing facilities nearby.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Fewer new homes on site. Development could have indirect impacts on the River Leen and Moor Pond Wood. Potential enhancement opportunities through the provision of new habitats and enhancing the setting of the river. There are water voles and white-clawed crayfish in the River Leen, and the river could be managed (e.g. reintroduce meanders in the river) to provide more potential for biodiversity.	Green infrastructure should be located next to the river, and impacts on the river should be minimised.
7. Landscape	Located roughly 1km from Linby and Papplewick which are Conservation Area villages. The landscape is quite enclosed and the development is unlikely to be visible from far away. Local concerns about possible impact of the development on the setting of Linby and Papplewick but impact is likely to be very limited.	Landscape screening around the edges of the site could mitigate for these impacts.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Air quality and water quality affected. North-eastern part of the site possibly affected by flooding. Development would be on greenfield site.	Avoid development in floodplain, and confirm that development would not have downstream impacts.
9. Waste	Size of development would influence impact on household waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	The site has significant potential for renewable energy.	Link to policy on Climate Change.
11. Transport	Site is on edge of Hucknall which has quite good transport links (tram, Hucknall station). Would not itself improve alternatives modes of transport. Integrated transport/walking and cycling package would be required.	
12. Employment	No new employment proposed in the Aligned Core Strategies.	
13. Innovation	Unknown.	
14. Economic Structure	No new employment proposed in the Aligned Core Strategies.	

Appraisal Mod12 –Brinsley (reduction of homes to 150)

Appraisal from Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version June 2012 Appendices (CD/REG/08)

															Very major/important positive	
															Major positive	
															Moderate to major positive	
															Moderate positive	
															Minor positive	
															<p>? = unknown impact</p> <p>No fill = negligible impact or not relevant</p>	
1. Housing					6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure			
	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social												Minor negative
																Moderate negative
																Moderate to major negative
																Major negative
															Very major/important negative	

SA Objectives	Appraisal MM9 – Brinsley	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Relatively smaller scale than other proposals.	
2. Health	Lack of local facilities.	
3. Heritage	Conservation Area and Brinsley Headstocks.	
4. Crime		Design out crime under Policy 10.
5. Social	Negligible impact.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Large SINC to northwest of village.	Avoid protected site.
7. Landscape	Mature Landscape Area to west.	Design Policy 10
8. Natural Resources and Flooding		
9. Waste	More development = more waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	More development = more energy use. Too limited development for alternatives viability.	
11. Transport	Negligible benefits. Minor bus support.	
12. Employment	Residential only proposal.	
13. Innovation		
14. Economic Structure		

Appraisal Mod13 –Eastwood (reduction of homes to 1,250)

Appraisal from Sustainability Appraisal Publication Version June 2012 Appendices (pages 133-134) (CD/REG/08)

														Very major/important positive
														Major positive
														Moderate to major positive
														Moderate positive
														Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	No fill = negligible impact or not relevant
														Minor negative
														Moderate negative
														Moderate to major negative
														Major negative
														Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod13 –Eastwood (reduction of homes to 1,250)	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Named settlement in Regional Plan but still outside main built up area. Less affordable housing potentially than elsewhere according to viability study.	
2. Health	May not generate new facilities because of scale of development but some existing facilities. Possible CIL contributions.	
3. Heritage	DH Lawrence country; and heritage town with conservation area. More so than others and SUE areas.	High standard of design in accordance with Policy 10
4. Crime		Design out crime under Policy 10
5. Social	Regenerative potential. New development creating more mixed community.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Negligible impact. Few nature conservation sites. Little opportunity for planning contributions.	Avoid allocated sites.
7. Landscape	Little allocated landscape designation.	Design policy implementation and consider new landscape designations (under NPPF?)
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Negligible impact	
9. Waste	More development = more waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	More development = more energy use. Too limited development for alternatives viability.	
11. Transport	Good bus service but no major public transport infrastructure. Planning contributions likely to be low.	
12. Employment	Town with existing employment and good access locally.	
13. Innovation	Limited to residential development therefore not relevant	
14. Economic Structure	Limited to residential development	

SA Objectives	Mod14 –Bestwood Village (reduction of homes to 260)	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Reduced to 260 new homes.	Link to policies requiring affordable housing.
2. Health	Close to Mill Lakes and Bestwood Country Park with opportunities to access recreational facility. There is currently no health facility within the village.	Provision to be made for health facilities.10% open space required.
3. Heritage	Bestwood has a Conservation Area. Access to Winding Engine House which would increase numbers of visitors to visitor centre.	
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards.	
5. Social	Development within the village likely to encourage integration with existing community facilities.	Section 106 agreement to ensure appropriate new or upgraded facilities would be provided to support the new and existing dwellings.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Access to Country Park.Without knowing specific locations, it is difficult to know what impact on biodiversity would be.	Link to policies on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.
7. Landscape	Depends on location of development. Existing historical/archaeological assets are within the village or nearby.	Refer to Greater Nottingham Landscape Character recommendations.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Air quality and water quality affected. BestwoodVillage has some flood-prone areas. Development may be on existing employment site (brownfield site).	Avoid flood-prone areas.
9. Waste	Size of development would influence impact on household waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	New houses would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings due to need to accord with current Building Regulations.	Link to policy on Climate Change.
11. Transport	Isolated location but size of development would help to sustain local facilities. Public transport accessibility is poor with indirect route to Hucknall. Would not reduce journeys undertaken by car. Integrated transport/walking and cycling package would be required	Section 106 agreement to ensure improvements to bus services.
12. Employment	No new employment proposed.	
13. Innovation	Unknown.	
14. Economic Structure	No new employment proposed.	

Appraisal Mod15 –Calverton (reduction of homes to 1055)

Appraisal from Gedling Borough’s Sustainability Appraisal on the scenarios tested (CD/EX/36)

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	7. Landscape	8. Natural Resources and flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy and Climate Change	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Mod15 –Calverton (reduction of homes to 1055)	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Reduced to 1,055 new homes.	Link to policies requiring affordable housing.
2. Health	Calverton is close to restored pit so potential for a Country Park with opportunities for access. There is a leisure centre within the village.	Provision to be made for health facilities. 10% open space required.
3. Heritage	Calverton has a Conservation Area.	
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards.	
5. Social	Development within the village will encourage integration with existing community facilities.	Section 106 agreement to ensure appropriate new or upgraded facilities would be provided to support the new and existing dwellings.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Access to the countryside. Without knowing specific locations, it is difficult to know what impact on biodiversity would be.</p> <p>Some areas of woodland to the north of Greater Nottingham, and extending into Gedling Borough, have been identified as a prospective Special Protection Area. Whilst this is not a formal designation, it does mean that these areas are under consideration by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, and may be declared a proposed Special Protection Area in due course. In this case it will be treated as if it is a fully designated protected European site, and full Special Protection Area status may follow.</p>	<p>Link to policies on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.</p> <p>For prospective Special Protection Area – a precautionary approach should be adopted and development north of the B6386 (north of Calverton) should be precluded.</p>
7. Landscape	Depends on location of development.	Refer to Greater Nottingham Landscape Character recommendations.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Air quality and water quality affected. Calverton has some flood-prone areas. Development would be on greenfield sites.	Avoid flood-prone areas.
9. Waste	Size of development would influence impact on household waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	New houses would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings due to need to accord with current Building Regulations.	Link to policy on Climate Change.
11. Transport	Size of development would help to sustain local facilities. Public transport accessibility is good but accessibility to facilities is poor. Poor road network between Calverton and the Nottingham Conurbation. Would not reduce journeys undertaken by car. Integrated transport/walking and cycling package would be required	Section 106 agreement to ensure improvements to bus services.
12. Employment	No new employment proposed.	
13. Innovation	Unknown.	

SA Objectives	Mod16 –Ravenshead (reduction of homes to 330)	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Reduced to 330new homes.	Link to policies requiring affordable housing.
2. Health	Ravenshead is near Newstead Abbey Country Park. There is a leisure centre within the village. The nearest health facility is Blidworth.	Provision to be made for health facilities. 10% open space required.
3. Heritage	Ravenshead has access to Newstead Abbey Country Park and Papplewick Hall.	
4. Crime	Development would be designed to Designing out Crime standards.	
5. Social	Development within the village likely to encourage integration with existing community facilities.	Section 106 agreement to ensure appropriate new or upgraded facilities would be provided to support the new and existing dwellings.
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	<p>Access to the countryside. Without knowing specific locations, it is difficult to know what impact on biodiversity would be.</p> <p>Some areas of woodland to the north of Greater Nottingham, and extending into Gedling Borough, have been identified as a prospective Special Protection Area. Whilst this is not a formal designation, it does mean that these areas are under consideration by the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, and may be declared a proposed Special Protection Area in due course. In this case it will be treated as if it is a fully designated protected European site, and full Special Protection Area status may follow.</p>	<p>Link to policies on Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity.</p> <p>For prospective Special Protection Area – a precautionary approach should be adopted and development west of A60 and north of Ricket Lane should be precluded.</p>
7. Landscape	Depends on location of development.	Refer to Greater Nottingham Landscape Character recommendations.
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	Air quality and water quality affected. Development would be on greenfield sites.	
9. Waste	Size of development would influence impact on household waste.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	New houses would be more energy efficient than the existing buildings due to need to accord with current Building Regulations.	Link to policy on Climate Change.
11. Transport	Isolated location but size of development would help to sustain local facilities. Public transport accessibility is poor. Accessibility to facilities is restricted. Would not reduce journeys undertaken by car. Integrated transport/walking and cycling package would be required	Section 106 agreement to ensure improvements to bus services.
12. Employment	No new employment proposed.	
13. Innovation	Unknown.	

SA Objectives	Mod18 –Policy 3: The Green Belt	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Policy wording is permissive for housing and therefore has positive housing benefits. Policy states that the Green Belt should be recast to accommodate SUEs. By not recasting Green Belt boundaries would result in the need to look for new sites outside the Green Belt. There would be not sufficient sites in accessible locations to meet local needs. Review criteria clarifies that Green Belt should be recast to permit development in other policies and plans and is more permissive.	
2. Health	No impact.	
3. Heritage	More impact on sites abutting main built up area. Not mentioned in criteria. Policies in other Local Plans.	
4. Crime	No impact.	
5. Social	Allows to develop on foundations that are already there in terms of facilities. SUEs are based nearer to cultural facilities and allow for social interaction.	
6. Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure	Recasting of Green Belt boundaries would lead to loss of sites in the Green Belt. If this review wasnot undertaken there would still be a requirement to build elsewhere. This would likely lead to town cramming which would result in negative impacts on inner urban sites. Alternatively there would be a need to develop in more remote locations where sites may be more sensitive in terms of ecology. Development adjacent to main built up area not necessarily worse than developing in other areas. Overall neutral.	
7. Landscape	As above for objective 6. Sensitive landscape around main built up area. If Green Belt sites are not released there would be a need to build elsewhere and consequently impacts on more remote locations or town cramming. Would mean less protected area.	
8. Natural Resources and Flooding	As above for objective 6. Greater site selection so those sites at risk of flooding could be avoided. Would protect sites adjacent to the main built up area at risk of flooding if the Green Belt were to remain as it is.	
9. Waste	No direct impact.	
10. Energy and Climate Change	If Green Belt isnot reviewed and sites from the Green Belt released, then other non-Green Belt sites further away from the main built up area would have to be released which would increase commuting distances. Therefore potential benefits to releasing Green Belt sites, but obvious implications of any development involving increased energy usage etc.	
11. Transport	Would develop on existing main built up area links if Green Belt sites adjacent to the main built up areaare released.	Prioritise modal shift.
12. Employment	Would allow SUEs to be developed with mixed use employment opportunities.	Would allow SUEs to be developed with mixed use employment opportunities.
13. Innovation	No impact.	

SA Objectives	Mod18 –Policy 3: The Green Belt	Ideas for mitigation
14. Economic Structure	Due to current economic climate, SUEs might not bring forward as many new employment sites as envisaged at the first stage of drafting the Aligned Core Strategies.	